

THE
INGOLDSBY
LETTERS

FOURTH EDITION



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

by
Re

32.








Believe me
Yrs faithfully
Seymour

Dec 27th 1878.

The Ingoldsby Letters.

Collective Edition.



INGOLDSBY RECTORY

[South View]

VOLUME II.

LONDON.

1879.

THE
INGOLDSBY LETTERS,

(1858—1878)

IN REPLY TO

THE BISHOPS IN CONVOCATION, THE HOUSE
OF LORDS, AND ELSEWHERE,

ON THE

Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

BY THE

REV. JAMES HILDYARD, B.D.,

RECTOR OF INGOLDSBY, LINCOLNSHIRE.

VOL. II.

ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.

“What I have written, I have written.”—JOHN xix. 22.

“I speak as to wise men: judge ye what I say.”—1 COR. x. 15.

Fourth Edition,

REVISED AND ENLARGED;
BRINGING THE REVISION MOVEMENT DOWN TO
THE PRESENT TIME.

CASSELL PETER & GALPIN:

LONDON, PARIS & NEW YORK.

1879.

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

“All establishments die of dignity. They are too proud to think themselves ill, and to take a little physic.”—*Edinburgh Review*.

“The question which the clergy have now to consider is, not whether they will accept any reformation, for that is now inevitable, but what kind of a reformation they will have.”—A. ALISON.

“The time has now fully come for carrying out the Reformation of the Church. It is all very well to write books; but unless writing be followed up by action, the books are soon forgotten, and the time for action passes away, never perhaps to return.”—THE SAME.

EX
5-15
H-
8-
V. 2

INTRODUCTION

TO THE SECOND VOLUME OF

THE FOURTH EDITION.

“Cast out the scorner, and contention shall go out; yea, strife and reproach shall cease.”—Prov. xxii. 10.

THE Author feels conscious that a few more last words are due from him to the public before sending forth again these thoughts and utterances, some of them of twenty years' date, and by which he is prepared to stand—fall he cannot much lower than he already is; and in which position he has been for the last thirty years and upwards, in the profession which he adopted originally for its own sake nearly half a century ago.

If that amount of experience is not sufficient to open a man's eyes, nothing will; but he is prepared to maintain not only that his eyes are open—and have been so for a long time—but, what is more to the point, his tongue, too, is loosed, and he has learned and fears not to speak plain.

He defies, accordingly, any one—as he has all along done—to answer him honestly, or turn his position;—which is simply this, that a New Reformation is needed in our Church, if we would have her hold her own against the many foes arrayed against her, the most formidable undoubtedly at this moment being those of her own household.

Why is it, he asks, that our Church is at this time, and has long notoriously been, as “a house divided against

itself?"—Why, but that the trumpet which should marshal all her troops in battle array against the common enemy, is found to give an uncertain sound, and the soldiers of Christ are consequently at fault, and unprepared for the battle. Instead of an united army, they more nearly represent the condition of the rabble rout in the camp of Midian, with every man's sword against his fellow, rejoicing chiefly when they can say or report some hard or spiteful thing one of another.

The object accordingly of the present re-publication, (and notably of this SECOND VOLUME), is, to point out how this distraction in our own camp arises from an irreconcilable difference of opinion on certain controverted points in the Prayer-book, which all the practised casuistry of Divines, and all the hired sophistry of the Law, have been unable to harmonise or explain away.

What, then, is the natural and unavoidable conclusion, but that the origin of the evil must be removed? The axe must be laid to the root of the tree of discord, before we can have any hope of permanent peace and quietness in the Church.

It is not seemly,—it is not right,—that this deadly cancer should be allowed to go on for ever, from year to year, fermenting and spreading its roots in the very vitals of the Church. No one can deny its existence; yet all seem to lack the courage necessary to attack the enemy in his stronghold—"that jewel the Prayer-book"—that is to say, that HALF-REFORMED PRAYER-BOOK, which has retained the seeds and germs of a suppressed, not extinguished, Popery for upwards of three hundred years.

Is it laziness? is it selfishness? is it cowardice?—or, if not these, WHAT is it—the Author (now in his seventieth year) asks fearlessly—which causes this shrinking from an undoubted duty? Each one in place of authority is seen to look vacantly on his neighbour, as if to say, Who is to

begin?—The Author scruples not to affirm that it is the duty of THE BISHOPS, as the reputed and exalted guardians of the Church, to take the initiative in the matter. The bulk of the clergy would quickly rally to their lead, and the laity be only too glad to follow them. All, all, with one consent, are scandalised, and naturally so, at things as they are, and would rejoice to see at length any way of escape from them.

It is pitiful—it is worse, it is wicked—that year after year, Law-term after Law-term, should witness some miserable theological quibble going on in the Courts, first in this diocese, then in that, all to end at the last in nothing but heavy costs, disgust, noise, and smoke ;—leading eventually to a repetition of the same farce, year by year, term by term. Is this, the Author would ask, to be always so?—If not, he demands (as an answer to his question), who is to prevent it? Who can prevent it, granting him to be ever so much disposed to do so. The utmost that the most ardent well wisher to our Church can do, is to “let these men alone ;”—and that is just what these disturbers of our Israel would like, and do most earnestly desire.

The Author has given, in the concluding Letter to this Volume, the mature result of his twenty years’ observation of “The Case as it Is,” and therewith has published his scheme, or idea, for grappling with, and stamping out, the admitted evil. His plan is simple and inoffensive ; but it would also prove, he firmly believes, an efficacious one, if boldly and honestly carried out, which it certainly might be.

Believing, further, that there is no other remedy—having heard at least and read of no other,—he calls upon the PUBLIC to support him in his demand for this ; and adds prayerfully, in conclusion, May God defend the Right.

Ingoldsbj Rectory, Dec. 30th, 1878.

INTRODUCTION
TO THE SECOND VOLUME OF
THE THIRD EDITION.

“Mellæo contingens cuncta lepore.”—LUCRET.

THERE are some people who will read an introduction to a book, and there stop. There are others who systematically pass over all prefaces, and rush at once *in medias res*. It is in the hope of inducing the former of these two classes to pursue their reading beyond the threshold, that the following remarks are made.

When the Author of these Letters first undertook the subject upon which he has been so long engaged, he was fully aware that he was entering upon one which would prove not only uninviting in itself, but calculated to array against him an immense amount of personal hostility. The latter of these contingencies he was prepared to brave, having frequently experienced it before, and having become consequently, like the eels, callous to the operation. But how to overcome the other and more serious objection to his undertaking was at first sight not so easy. No one will read a dull book if he can help it. And as the subject of Liturgical Revision is essentially a dull one to the million, there was not the slightest chance of obtaining readers so long as the old beaten track was pursued of arguing the question merely upon the merits. The only hope of a hearing lay, accordingly, in being able either to provoke or to amuse.

That the Author has succeeded in provoking, he is painfully

aware—but he has no further indulged in the caustic vein than the necessity of the case demanded ; and more than once has reined in with difficulty, where the temptation was strong to proceed ; using therein the art of one—

———“*parentis viribus, atque
Extenuantis eas consulto.*”

Whether he has been equally successful in amusing, he must leave others to judge—but he ventures to believe that he will be acquitted of having in any instance introduced raillery into the graver portion of his subject. He has only indulged in it so far as the *argumentum ad hominem* fairly admitted of such a line being taken, as, for example, in the case of the Ten Thousand Clerical Remonstrants, or the scene of the Rivals in the House of Lords. And in return, he is quite prepared to bear with equanimity any retort that may be made upon himself by the use of similar missiles, to which, like every occupant of a glazed house, he is doubtless abundantly open.

All that he would protest against, is, that his work should be judged as if that which is the mere anointing of the lips of his cup were really its contents. He has designedly irritated, in order to provoke to a remedy. He has studied to amuse, with the serious intent of cheating into amendment.

If the Liturgical Reformers could gain a full audience, they are unanswerable. “Strike me, but hear me,” said the Greek Patriot ; and so says the Author of these Letters. If any one can charge him with seeking gain to himself from the course he has taken, he is dumb. But if not, he claims to be heard ; and being heard, claims to be answered.

What he demands, and has demanded all along, is a FAIR COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—not a Commission consisting from the outset of irreconcilable elements, like oil and vinegar in the same vessel—but a Commission which should undertake the

work with no preconceived opinions, and with a hearty desire to bring the Book of Common Prayer into unison with the known requirements and spirit of the age; at the same time stemming the tendency towards ROME—THE MASS, in short, IN MASQUERADE—which all true lovers of the Church of their forefathers cannot but notice and deplore, and are bound in honour to do their utmost to prevent.*

Ingoldsby Rectory,
near Grantham, Lincolnshire.
Feb. 19th, 1863.

* This last point is entirely overlooked in the Report of the Ritual Commission of 1870, which is chiefly conspicuous for a large amount of tithing mint, anise, and cummin, to the neglect of the weightier matters for which the cry for REVISION had gone forth. See APPENDIX A, Vol. I., p. 426.

TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. II.

LETTER	PAGE
LXX. Retrospect of Revision for the Year 1859	1
LXXI. Dean Trench and the Anti-Revisionists	6
LXXII. The Rev. C. H. Davis on Liturgical Revision.....	12
LXXIII. Resignation of Canon Wodehouse, and the <i>Times</i> . ..	17
LXXIV. Common Sense about the Church.....	22
LXXV. A Limited, or Unlimited Commission !	28
LXXVI. The Bishop of Carlisle (Montagu Villiers)	34
LXXVII. Bishop Villiers on Revision of the Liturgy.....	40
LXXVIII. The Church Cause and the Church Party	45
LXXIX. Aquila de Rupe, the Rev. Richard Bingham	49
LXXX. Thoughts on the Liturgy, by Rev. Philip Gell ...	54
LXXXI. The Liturgy and Dissenters, by Rev. I. Taylor ...	60
LXXXII. Advance of the Ten Thousand	67
LXXXIII. Rev. F. Massingberd on Revision of Prayer-book. ..	75
LXXXIV. Debate in House of Lords on Revision, May 8, 1860 ..	81
LXXXV. Lord Ebury in the House of Lords, May 8, 1860. ..	87
LXXXVI. Archbishop Sumner in Reply to Lord Ebury.....	93
LXXXVII. Lord Lyttelton on the Revision of the Liturgy ...	101
LXXXVIII. Archbishop Whately as a Revisionist.....	107
LXXXIX. Archbishop Whately on Non-doctrinal Revision..	111
XC. Objections urged against all Change	117
XCI. Omission of parts construed as Rejection	120
XCI. Bishop of London in Reply to Lord Ebury, No. 1	125
XCII. Bishop of London in Reply to Lord Ebury, No. 2	130
XCIV. The Revised Prayer-book of 1852	138
XCV. Earl Stanhope on the Revision of the Liturgy ...	140
XCVI. Bishop Wilberforce in Reply to Lord Ebury	145
XCVII. The Reviewer Reviewed	152
XCVIII. Bishop Baring on Revision of Prayer-book, No. 1	158
XCIX. Bishop Baring on Revision of Prayer-book, No. 2	161
C. The Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, 1860	166
CI. Charge of Bishop Wilberforce, Nov., 1860.....	171
CII. The Assent and Consent. What does it imply? ...	178

LETTER	PAGE
CIII. The Prayer-book Remodelled. An Experiment...	183
CIV. Association for Promoting Revision of Prayer-book	195
CV. The Doctrinal Revisionists	199
CVI. Charge of the Bishop of St. David's (Thirlwall) ...	204
CVII. Retrospect of Revision for the Year 1860	211
CVIII. Canonical and Rubrical Reform	217
CIX. A Layman's Thoughts on the Church	227
CX. Examination for Bishoprics and other Dignities...	233
CXI. The Rev. Christopher Nevile on the Prayer-book.	241
CXII. Negative Theology an Argument for Revision ...	251
CXIII. The Church and the Nonconformists, Mountfield.	258
CXIV. Dublin Association for Revision of the Prayer-book	262
CXV. Church Questions, by the Rev. C. Robinson	265
CXVI. The Dean of Norwich in Convocation, 1861	270
CXVII. Lord Ebury in the House of Lords, July 22, 1861	274
CXVIII. An Hour with Spurgeon. No. 1. The Conventicle	279
CXIX. An Hour with Spurgeon. No. 2. The Service ...	285
CXX. An Hour with Spurgeon. No. 3. The Preacher...	292
CXXI. The Compass and Church Reformer.....	300
CXXII. Retrospect of Revision for the Year 1861	307
CXXIII. Lord Ebury's Two Bills of 1862	312
CXXIV. Lord Ebury and the <i>Saturday Review</i> , No. 330 ...	320
CXXV. The Permissive Bill of 1862.....	326
CXXVI. Lord Ebury in the House of Lords, May 27, 1862	332
CXXVII. Charges of Bishops of Worcester and London, 1862	336
CXXVIII. Retrospect of Revision from 1858 to 1863, and Prospects for the Future.....	343
CXXIX. Structural Revision of the Liturgy	350
CXXX. The Vacant Proctorship for the Diocese of Lincoln	356
CXXXI. Inquisitorial Bishops and Rural Deans	361
CXXXII. Dean McNeile and the Athanasian Creed	373
CXXXIII. The Supply of Candidates for Holy Orders.....	379
CXXXIV. The Only Way of Overcoming the Difficulty	387
Postscript to Fourth Edition, 1878.....	392
Index.....	397

“Judi Alteram Partem.”

REPLY TO THE BISHOPS, &c.,

ON THE

Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

The following Letters, like those in Vol. I., appeared originally in various London and Provincial Newspapers at the date attached to each.

LETTER LXX.

RETROSPECT OF REVISION FOR THE YEAR 1859.

“Cum se verterit annus.”—JUVENAL.

TO THE EDITOR, ETC.

SIR,—At the commencement of last year we took a review of the position of the Liturgical warfare,* which has been now carried on with more or less activity for some time; and we see no reason for departing from the practice on the present occasion.

There is always this advantage, if no other, in adopting such a course. It serves to keep the subject of Revision before the public eye; to let the opponents of the measure see that the enemy are still advancing, or, if not advancing, certainly not retreating from the ground they have occupied;†

* See Vol. I., Letter xli., pp. 270—276.

† *Non regredi*, in this case, as in some others, *est progredi*. The Revisionists have at least stood their ground, and time has visibly strengthened their position.†

and that, moreover, they show no signs of any present intention to do so. It gives confidence to the timid; it serves to fix the waverers; it contributes more than anything to draw a clear line of demarcation between those who are for, and those who are against, the issue of a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Prayer-book.

Now, it is certain, as we said before,* that if "this work and this counsel" be of Divine origin, "nothing can overthrow it." It is equally certain that "if it be of men, it will come to nought." And the time seems drawing near which is to decide the question.† One thing meanwhile is evident to the most casual observer of this long-continued struggle—namely, that the opponents of the Revision of the Prayer-book have departed, or have been driven, from their original tactics of passive resistance.

Their Gamaliel, whoever he may be, has relinquished the sage counsel once given, and acted on, to "let these men alone," to "refrain from them," and see if they did not share the fate of "one Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody." The aggressive movement has been too apparent, too systematic, too sustained, to render such a policy any longer either tenable or expedient. The fire would not go out of itself; the smothered smoke would keep bursting into flames here and there; fresh fuel was still forthcoming, notwithstanding all the pains taken to remove inflammatory material out of sight and reach. It was in vain that bishops and archdeacons‡ pooh-poohed the subject in their charges; in

* Vol. I., Letter LV., p. 345.

† The issue of the Rubrical Commission was at that time under consideration, but its very constitution precluded from the first any useful result from its labours. See Appendix A, Vol. I., p. 426.

‡ The Archdeacon of Taunton (Denison), for example, called the Revision movement "a poor, weak, and miserable agitation." The Bishop of Oxford compared the agitators to the "scene-shifters and candle-snuffers flitting across the stage to represent a vast army."

vain the *Guardian* ignored the very existence of the agitation ; in vain the great leviathan of the press was instructed to give out that the cry for Revision of the Book of Common Prayer was "one of those eccentric topics which periodically arise, and revolve in cycles of ten, twenty, thirty, or forty years,"* and then, after agitating the public mind *for a few weeks (!)*, are at length "squashed" by the good sense (or the "non-sense") of the community, and so disappear till their orbit again brings them into momentary notice.

Here, notwithstanding, the comet still is, in full blaze, with its tail no less,† its terrors undiminished, approaching nearer and still more near to this our little world of busy and practical life. So at length the hearts of the anti-Revisionists begin to fail them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the Church. Accordingly, in place of the contempt of the last three or four years, we have a dreadful panic got up ; a cry of "the Church in danger" is raised ; a Church Preservation Institution is hurriedly organised ; London is mapped out into thirty-five districts for the purpose of preserving the peace ; and the two consuls for the year, Lord Nelson and Alexander Beresford Hope, have it in charge, *Ne quid detrimenti capiat Liturgia !* The dictator,‡ indeed, keeps prudently out of sight ; but his lieutenant§ appears in full panoply, with a clerical staff and body-guard

* See leading article of the *Times*, Nov. 1, 1859.

† The Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer-book was first formed in December, 1859, and has kept steadily increasing in members and funds ever since. Its title has now developed into "An Association of Evangelical men for promoting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and such other reforms in the Church of England as will strengthen its Protestant and Scriptural character."

‡ The Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, sometime Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester.

§ The Very Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench, at that time Dean of Westminster and Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, now Archbishop of Dublin (1878).

of seventy chosen officers;* and forth they go to meet the enemy in open field, followed presently (as we are told by the *English Churchman*) by no less than 4,000 devotees, who have boldly enrolled themselves as volunteers for the service.

All this is truly alarming; and betokens a conviction on the part of the opponents of Revision that they are no longer fighting with a shadow—that the lion can bite as well as growl, and that it will not do to leave him any longer with his claws unpared—his teeth undrawn.

So much, then, for this new and significant phasis of the war which the past year has unmistakably developed.

But is there nothing else to mark the year 1859 as a memorable one in the era of the approaching Church revolution? It would be a curious sum for a candidate at the Middle Class Examinations to reckon up all the pamphlets, tracts, leading articles, letters, &c., that have issued from the press in one continuous stream (and almost without exception on the side favourable to Revision)† during the past twelve months. The enemy have been openly challenged to bring forth their strong reasons, and they are silent.‡ Not an argument is advanced against the measure, save and except the old stale one of “this is not the time.”§ The position, in

* Such was the original number of conspirators round which the army of “the 10,000” ultimately rallied.

† One on the other side, by the Rev. F. C. Massingberd, after being advertised in the *Lincolnshire Chronicle*, was at the eleventh hour very prudently suppressed. See more of this gentleman, Vol. I., pp. 309, 326.

‡ See in particular Mr. Davis’s pamphlet, with Introduction by Lord Ebury; 1859: p. 13, &c. Vol. I., Letter LXVII., p. 400.

§ As a curious illustration of the above, I may be allowed to quote the following letter received by Lord Ebury:—

“My Lord.—I have signed Dean Trench’s document; but your Lordship should fully understand, that (if I err not) *very many will sign simply as I do*, because this is thought *an inconvenient time* for making or seeking alteration. —That our excellent Prayer-book may be made more excellent, I am

fact, is conceded; the only hope left to the opposition is to avail themselves of the miserable subterfuge which the chapter of accidents is always ready to hold out to the indolent and the fearful.

Nor must we omit from a catalogue of the advantages which the last year has added to our cause the enormous impulse the movement has received during that interval from the insane conduct of the officiating clergy at St. George's-in-the-East. The persevering efforts of those gentlemen to revive within the Church certain obsolete dresses, ceremonies, and attitudes, which they defend by an appeal to the Prayer-book,* or else defy their bishop to disallow by the weight of the same authority, have done more probably than anything else within the last twelve months to convince the public mind that it is high time that steps be taken to make the law of the Church more clear and definite on these matters.† And this, taken in connexion with the not-yet-forgotten proceedings at St. Barnabas‡ and St. Paul's Knightsbridge, the battle of the Boyne, and the West Lavington affair (so mysteriously hushed up), has led inquiring people to wonder why these things are, and whether it be not possible to prevent them for the future. But as we have already§ enlarged upon this subject, we will not repeat ourselves here.

Suffice it to say that we think it proved beyond the reach

sure. . . . All thanks to your Lordship, say I, for your repeated attempts to benefit us and our Church.

"A COUNTRY PARSON, late of Christchurch, Oxford."

Of this number Canon Stowell was a notable example: see his letter to the *Record* of Jan. 13, 1860. Letter LXXI., p. 8.

* See Vol. I., Letter LVIII., p. 356.

† See Letter of the Bishop of Worcester (Philpott) on the Ritual practices at Trinity, Bordesley, Birmingham, November, 1867.

‡ Two more perversions from the clergy of this church were reported in the *Times* of Jan. 2, 1860—the Rev. Messrs. Fothergill and Wormal, the one from St. Paul's, the other from St. Barnabas, Knightsbridge.

§ See Vol. I., Letters LXIV., LXVI., pp. 379—399.

of contradiction that the question of a Revision of the Prayer-book has made great advance during the year just past; so much so, indeed, as to render it hardly a matter of doubt that it will at length be seriously undertaken. Let it be henceforth an object of prayer that it be done well and effectually; and let the energies of all true friends of the Church be devoted to that end, instead of to the thankless office of signing a document which will prove but so much waste paper, while exhibiting the clergy in the unenviable position of being the only persons in the kingdom who are content to stand still, while the rest of the world is progressing rapidly around them.

Yours, obediently,

Jan. 1, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXI.

THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER (TRENCH), AND THE ANTI-REVISIONISTS.

“Gnosius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna,
Castigatque auditque dolos.”—VIRG.

SIR,—The great feature of the Revision movement with which the new year opens being the manifesto of five clergymen headed by the Very Rev. Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., Dean of Westminster, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, I do not see how we can select a fitter subject for our letter of this week than a critical dissection of this very curious document.*

The manifesto is as follows: and is addressed—and I believe has been sent—to every clergyman in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.†

* See Lord Ebury's critique upon this singular State Paper in his speech of May 8, 1860. Hatchard.

† The Irish Church not being then disestablished, a large portion of the signatures to this manifesto was obtained (*valeat quantum*) from the Sister Isle.

“ 69, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London, Dec. 5, 1859.

“ Rev. Sir,—We send you an extract from a speech of Lord Ebury, to which he now adheres; and we invite your co-operation in satisfying his lordship that the great body of the clergy object to any alterations in the Liturgy at the present time, by signing the enclosed declaration, and returning it, as directed, at your earliest convenience.

We are, Rev. Sir, your faithful servants,

R. C. TRENCH, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

R. W. JELF, D.D., Principal of King’s College, and Canon of Christchurch, Oxford.

WM. J. IRONS, D.D., Incumbent of Brompton, Middlesex.

JNO. EDWD. KEMPE, M.A., Rector of St. James’s, Westminster.

CHAS. JAS. PHIPPS EYRE, M.A., Rector of St. Marylebone, London.

Extract from Lord Ebury’s speech, in the House of Lords, on the Revision of the Liturgy, on the 6th of May, 1858; revised and published, 1859 :—

‘ I am sure your lordships will agree with me in thinking that any attempt to force alterations on the clergy of the Established Church which are distasteful, I will not say to the majority, but even to any considerable minority of them, would be as foolish as it would be fruitless.’ ”

Then follows this declaration :—

“ We, the undersigned Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, desire to express our conviction that any attempt *at the present time* to alter the Book of Common Prayer would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church.”

To this document were appended, in the copy that reached me by post, seventy signatures, four of them being a repetition of the above; the only name not appearing *twice* being that of the Very Rev. the Dean.

Of the remaining sixty-six signatures, the principal were :—

W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Vicar of Frome (late of Knightsbridge).

T. DALE, M.A., Canon of St. Paul’s.

G. A. DENISON, M.A., Archdeacon, Taunton.

F. R. GREY, M.A., R.D., Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne.

- J. JEBB, M.A., Prebendary, Hereford, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Hereford.
 R. LIDDELL, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.
 A. M'CAUL, D.D., Prebendary, St. Paul's, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of London.
 F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A., Prebendary, Lincoln, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln.
 E. A. OMMANEY, M.A., Prebendary, Wells, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Bath and Wells.
 Sir G. PROVOST, Bart., M.A., Honorary Canon, Gloucester, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
 Sir H. THOMPSON, M.A., Prebendary, Chichester, Rural Dean, Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Chichester.*
 H. A. WOODGATE, B.D., R.D., Proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of the Diocese of Worcester.

The date of these signatures having been obtained would seem to be on or before December 5, 1859; and after the document had been advertised in all the papers for a week, we find (in a list published December 12, in the *Morning Post*, accompanied by a fierce leading article) four more names collected, which it is due to the exertions of the five clergymen forming the committee, and their friends extending from Lindisfarne to Taunton, should be here given at length. They are—

- S. A. FOOTE, St. Mary, Paddington.
 T. W. PERRY, Addington.†
 JAMES SKINNER (*Stut nominis umbra*), and
 HUGH STOWELL, M.A., Hon. Canon, Chester.‡

Making in all seventy-four names up to that date.

Now, a few remarks may be fairly made upon the above

* This gentleman, however, subsequently advocated in Convocation several important Reforms in the Prayer-book.

† Afterwards the highly Ritualistic Curate of St. Michael's, Brighton, and obstructive member of the Royal Commission on Ritual, 1867-70.

‡ Who subsequently, by his own letter to the *Record* of Jan. 13, 1860, confessed that he was a Revisionist notwithstanding! See p. 4.

document. First of all, we happen to know, from private but reliable information, that the collection of these signatures was commenced a full month previous to the date on which the said paper reached ourselves;—also that very urgent arguments were used to obtain the reluctant signatures of some of those whose names are attached;—also that the phrase “at this present time” was carefully inserted as an afterthought in order to remove the scruples of those who were of opinion that the Book of Common Prayer did require alteration.

In corroboration of this latter statement, the *English Churchman*, of December 22, goes so far as to say, “In supporting the above declaration, neither we, nor those who sign it, are thereby precluded from advocating such additions to, or revisions of, the Rubrics of the Prayer-book, as are obviously necessary under our altered circumstances.” Whereas, it must be admitted, the *Clerical Journal* of the same date proclaims in conspicuous type, that “The Liturgical Revision question is likely to be set at rest for a time,* if the prompt and vigorous action of some clergymen is followed up by those of their brethren who agree with them on this important subject.”

And now for a few of the signatures attached to the manifesto. Imprimis, what are we to think of so many “Proctors,” or clerical legislators—who, it is generally understood, are sent to Convocation (if for any purpose at all) to *debate* and to *judge* upon such matters affecting the Church as may be brought before them—what, I say, are we to think of them in such capacity, when we find them thus *prejudging* a most important measure, before even hearing it discussed; and so proclaiming to the world their incompetency for the office to which they are supposed to

* See Vol. I., Letter xvi., p. 115.

be elected,* by announcing in print that their minds are made up before ever the cause has been brought into Court?—Defend us from being tried before such a jury! The like, I suppose, has not occurred since the days of the Cretan Jeffreys,† who, fortunately for the Church, has his jurisdiction in the Infernal Regions, and not in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster.

Secondly, as to the unnatural conjunction of names which this State Paper exhibits. Bennett and Dale, Liddell and Stowell, Denison and Sir H. Thompson, &c. &c., entering by pairs, like impossible roots into an equation. Well may the promoters of this counter-irritation give out that their object is to “preserve the peace and unity of the Church,” when thus the leopard and the kid, the wolf and the lamb, the young lion and the calf, are seen meekly grazing together, and a little child, in the shape of the Bishop of Oxford (or *his chaplain*, which is the same thing) leading them!

But thirdly, and lastly, of this said little child—How are we to reconcile the avowed advocate for a REVISION of the BIBLE with the leader of a faction for resisting and effectually quashing the very idea of a Revision of the Prayer-book? The thing is ridiculous.

To say nothing of the fact that the revision of the former would of necessity entail the revision of the latter (by reason of the alterations in the Epistles, Gospels, Psalms,‡ &c.), what becomes of such a magniloquent sentence as the following, from his own mouth?

“On the whole, I am persuaded that a revision *ought to come*; I am convinced that it will come. . . . Believing

* Of the so-called *election* of Proctors, see Vol. I., pp. 309-13.

† See motto at the head of this Letter.

‡ On this particular head I wish the Bible Revisionists may not find that they have undertaken a task far beyond their power. Cranmer's version of the Psalms will not easily be improved upon.

that this *mountain* of difficulty will have to be *surmounted*, I can only trust that it, like other *mountains*, will not, on nearer approach, prove so formidable as at a distance it appears.”*

There is a good deal of elevation of sentiment as well as of language in the above paragraph, and something that reminds one forcibly of the Bishop of Oxford’s style.† “Like will to like,” they say. “*Simile gaudet simili*,” observed one of the ancients. And our mediæval Bishop no doubt feels quite at home in the presence of his like-minded and like-worded chaplain. Whether the latter is an exponent of his patron’s views on a revised translation of the *Bible* or not, I am ignorant; but I shall take leave to conclude this article with another quotation from the Dean’s little book, which applies so exactly to the present state of the *Prayer-book* controversy, that nothing short of a judicial blindness, one would think, could have shut the author’s eyes to its adaptation to the latter subject, which he is madly and hopelessly doing his utmost to prevent:—

“There are times when the whole matter presents itself as so full of difficulty and doubtful hazard, that one could be well content to resign all gains that would accrue from this revision, and only ask that all things might remain as they were. *But this I am persuaded is impossible*; however we may be disposed to let the question alone, it will not let us alone.‡ *It has been too effectually stirred ever*

* Dean Trench on the Authorised Version, &c., Introduction, p. 3. J. W. Parker, West Strand. 1858.

† See the Bishop of Oxford’s speech in reply to Lord Ebury, May 8, 1860: “Here two great truths arise, separate like two mountain peaks,” &c.

‡ “The days of peace, unity, and the Prayer-book as it is, are ended. For good or for evil this is a fact.” (Reply to the Westminster Declaration by the Rev. Hugh McNeile, of Liverpool, December 28, 1859. London: C. F. Hodgson, Gough Square, Fleet Street. 1860.)

again to go to sleep, and the difficulties, be they few or many, will have one day to be encountered. The time will come when the inconveniences of remaining where we are will be so manifestly greater than the inconveniences of action, that this last will become inevitable.”*

Commending these words to the attention of the great body of the clergy† who are now invited by the Dean and his four colleagues to sign the above declaration in favour of standing still,

I remain, yours, &c.,

Jan. 10th, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXII.

THE REV. C. H. DAVIS ON LITURGICAL REVISION—CHAPTER I.,
“THE CASE AS IT IS.”

“Brevis esse laboro;
Obscurus fio.”—HOR.

“I strive to be concise;
I prove obscure.”—FRANCIS.

SIR,—It is time we reverted to the volume named at the head of this article, our further notice of which has been postponed from week to week by press of other matter demanding more immediate attention.

Lord Ebury, in his neatly-penned Introduction to Mr. Davis’s work,‡ considers it a point in its favour that the author “has managed to compress his matter within small

* Dean Trench on Revision, &c., p. 137.

† According to the best calculation, the clergy of the United Kingdom, to all of whom (as far as their addresses could be obtained) this document was sent, amount to about 23,000. Of this number somewhat less than 10,000 were induced by various means and appliances to sign.

‡ See first Review of this work, Vol. I., Letter LXVII., p. 400.

compass." There are, however, certain subjects which do not admit of this compression (generally so desirable), without leading to the fatal consequence of which we are forewarned by the poet in our motto of to-day. Of this nature that of Liturgical Revision eminently partakes;—witness the eight previous treatises of our indefatigable author on the same topic!—witness the almost innumerable publications that have issued upon the same subject from other pens within the last few years—witness Mr. Fisher's "Liturgical Purity," extending to 667 pages!—witness (if we may be permitted to say so) the "Ingoldsby Letters," now running beyond their three-score and ten, and yet finding the work growing daily, like the Hydra of Hercules, upon the author's hands.

The result of Mr. Davis's attempt at compression is, to our judgment, anything but satisfactory; while we by no means withhold from him the praise, which is justly his due, of exhibiting thus in small compass a vast weight of authority for the various amendments in the Prayer-book suggested in his volume. No small amount of credit is also due to Messrs. Seeley and Jackson for the manner in which their portion of the task has been executed. Whatever clearness of type, varied headings, divisions and sub-divisions of chapters and sections, could accomplish, has been done; while still one is obliged to confess that the attempt at a continuous perusal produces a feeling of lassitude somewhat akin to one's sensations upon awaking at midnight after an undigested supper upon lobster salad. The matter oppresses one, and is not greatly relieved by the manner in which it is served up.

Chapter I. treats of "The Case as it is," and to that one topic we mean to confine ourselves to-day.

The author specifies four causes as having tended, of late, to direct public attention to the importance of Revision. We

think he might have enlarged here with advantage, instead of compressing.

Many causes besides those mentioned (which are rather, indeed, secondary than primary—rather consequents, in fact, than antecedents) have combined, within the last two or three years, to revive the almost extinct question of Liturgical Revision. Mr. Davis, for example, omits altogether the presentation of the original petition by Lord Robert Grosvenor in the House of Commons in 1857—a far more important step, in our judgment, than the presentation of that of the 460 clerical petitioners in 1859; in just so much as the House of Commons is superior to the House of Lords as an index of public opinion; and in just so much as the petition of 1857 was the first breaking of the ice, the *premier pas*, the value of which we all know; the identifying, in short, a well-known public character with a *single question*. That first petition, moreover, was comprehensive in its character,* and, by consequence, not exposed to the but too just criticism which Lord Lyttelton has passed upon that of the 460 petitioners, of being “one-sided.” We take upon ourselves to express our firm conviction, that had the type of that first petition been followed in all subsequent stages of this business, we should never have heard of the Westminster manifesto of December, 1859, and the stress therein laid on the danger of disturbing the “peace and unity” of the Church.

Secondly, Mr. Davis takes no notice of the enormous impulse given to the question of Revision by the conduct of the Romanising party within the Church, “the alarming state of the diocese of Oxford,” the affair of West Lavington,† Mr. Poole, the battle of the Boyne, the riots at St. George’s, and other similar matters, which are all more or less traceable

* See the Petition at length, Vol. I., Letter iv., p. 21.

† See “A Statement submitted to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chichester, by an English Churchman.” Second Edition. Hatchard and Co. 1858.

to the fact of the Prayer-book itself being not sufficient to meet the difficulties that have arisen from the late attempts to carry out its directions to the letter.

Thirdly, our author, in his striving after brevity, has omitted what to our belief has, above everything else, contributed to bring about that state of things which he defines as "The Case as it is." We mean the suicidal effort of the united hierarchy in the Convocation of 1858 to stifle the voice of public opinion by an *ipse dixit*, only paralleled in our experience by the obstinacy of the Duke of Wellington and his Cabinet in 1830, when they attempted to stem the popular cry for Parliamentary Reform by an unanimous vote of *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*.

We all know how that arbitrary announcement was resented by the free spirit of Englishmen. And though it may be that the minds of *clergymen* are, by the nature of their position, so "iron-clasped and iron-bound," that they find it difficult to give as open an expression to their feelings as was done by the *people* in 1830-31; and though, in consequence, the Bishop of Oxford's chaplain may succeed in drawing after him a considerable tail of servile followers, who are willing to leave things as they are "for this present time," *i.e.*, for the remainder of their lives (on the principle of Lord Ebury's memorable application to the Bishops of that expressive sentence, "Give peace in our time, O Lord" *); yet, still, we are persuaded, that the so-called *unanimous* voice of the Bishops *against any change in the Prayer-book* has done, and will do, more to bring about the much-dreaded result than all Mr. Davis's four secondary causes put together; and the hoodwinked clergy will find at last, to their cost, that the refusal to listen to a few reasonable and practical reforms will gradually and surely, notwithstanding all

* See Vol. I., Letter xxii., p. 159.

resistance from within, bring about a much more fundamental revolution in the Church than was ever dreamt of at the beginning by the primary movers in this matter.*

This is *our* opinion of "The Case as it is;" and time will show whether we are right or not in our prognostications. We are at the commencement of a new era in the history of Liturgical Revision. There must be, in short, either a compromise of conflicting opinions, by mutual concession, with a view to peace; or war—war to the knife—will become the watchword of the two parties in the struggle. And grievously have we misread all history, and to small purpose have we applied the lessons of experience which should hallow grey hairs, if we do not prophesy aright in saying, that the continued resistance to Lord Ebury's most temperate request, for a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon these matters, will be followed sooner or later by an amount of organic change in the constitution of the Church for which few are probably now prepared.†

Not easily again will the sore places of the Prayer-book fall into the hands of so gentle a physician; long, and in vain, shall we look hereafter for one so careful to cover, while he seeks earnestly to remove, its admitted defects.

Jan. 31, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

* The question, from having been originally a proposal for a Royal Commission to inquire into the Prayer-book, assumed afterwards the more serious form of a cry for an alteration in the terms of subscription, and a repeal of the Act of Uniformity of 1662. The Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, ex-Chancellor of Ireland, and afterwards one of the Royal Commissioners on the Rubrics, wrote to the author, March 7, 1874, "If men were wise, they would agree to a Moderate Revision; but if not, it will be postponed, and a sweeping Revision come in the end." There is now every probability of this being the ultimate issue.

† The Revised Prayer-book now in use in the disestablished Irish Church is a strong confirmation of the remark made in the text. (1878.)

LETTER LXXIII.

RESIGNATION OF CANON WODEHOUSE, AND THE "TIMES"
NEWSPAPER.

"By it he, being dead, yet speaketh."—Heb. xi. 4.

SIR,—The readers of the *Times*, if they care to burden their memories for three weeks together with the *dicta* of the oracle, may remember that some time during last month there appeared a leading article against the Revision of the Prayer-book, founded on a letter of Mr. Nihill's to the Dean of Westminster, and sent to that paper by Lord Ebury.

The writer of that article took upon himself to say, that "although 463 clergymen of the Church of England might sign a memorial to the effect that their consciences were oppressed by certain passages in the Book of Common Prayer, from which they prayed to be relieved, they would nevertheless remain *very comfortably* upon their livings."*

Now, as we were not of the number of the said 463, who have been the butt for incessant attack in the columns of the *Guardian*,† *English Churchman*, and *Clerical Journal*, we are the more at liberty to say a few words in their defence; and though we do not participate in all their objections to the Prayer-book as it is, yet, recognising the reasonableness of a great portion of those objections, we hesitate not to say that these gentlemen are deserving rather of honour than abuse, for thus boldly coming forward and declaring their grievance, instead of suppressing opinions, the enunciation of which might seem to be at issue with their temporal interests.

What, then, are we to say of the *Times*, whose cold-

* See also the *Times* of July 24, 1861, upon Lord Ebury's notice of a motion to relieve the clergy from the present stringent form of subscription.

† See for example a letter from the Rev. T. Julius Henderson, of Kennington, Berks, in the *Guardian* of February 22, 1860.

blooded sarcasm, if it took the effect intended, would drive these 463 clergymen (as the 2,000 were driven in 1662)* to starvation, seeing that an unrepealed canon of the Church prevents their betaking themselves to any other mode of livelihood;† or would leave them still upon their preferments under the imputation of dishonesty‡ and duplicity, because forsooth they deem they have at least as much *locus standi* in the Church as Archdeacon Denison, Mr. Bennett of Frome, and the Rev. Bryan King?§

But we deny the hypothesis so “comfortably” assumed by the *Times*. There happen to lie within the limited circle of our own acquaintance not less than *four* most estimable clergymen of high honour and nice sense of duty, who *have* resigned their preferments, on the grounds of some one or more of the articles specified in the Manifesto of the 463. All of these are men having families, one of them a very large one, consisting of not less than eight or nine young children; yet he did not hesitate to make the fearful sacrifice entailed upon him by his taking this step, notwithstanding the insinuation of the *Times* that “the clergy are the only profession who can be content to live comfortably without a conscience.”

And now comes the recent, and therefore more startling case of the Rev. Canon Wodehouse, of Norwich.||

* See a short and vivid account of the sufferings of the Nonconformists, by the Rev. D. Mountfield. Second Edition. Kent and Co., London. 1862.

† An unsuccessful attempt to repeal this canon was made by Mr. Bouverie in the House of Commons in the Session of 1862, but a law has since passed allowing them to “unfrock” themselves, on condition of never entering into Holy Orders again.

‡ Archdeacon Paley incurred the censure of Dr. Parr for giving out publicly that “he could not afford to keep a conscience.”

§ The *Times* defends the position of these men and others by what it is pleased to call “an understanding.”—*Anglicè*, a solemn fraud.

|| See his Letter to the Bishop of Norwich. London: Jarrold and Sons, 47, St. Paul’s Churchyard, 1860; also another to the Bishop of London,

This gentleman, well known to all members of the Church for the active steps he has taken at various times to obtain relief in these matters, is described in the *Norfolk News*—(quoted by the *Times* of last week)—as an “amiable and conscientious clergyman.” He is, further, in about his 70th year; so that at any rate he is not chargeable with the precipitancy of youth, or immaturity of judgment. What he gives up, is a valuable canonry, a living, and a chaplaincy; principally—to use his own words—because he would be called upon in March next, by virtue of this last office, to assist at the bishop’s ordination, and so “appear to approve of a form of words in that service which is now so objectionably interpreted or understood”—those words being as follow:—“Receive thou the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.”*

Upon the reasonableness, or the reverse, of the Canon’s scruples on this head, we shall decline at present giving any opinion of our own, having it in our power to set before our readers the much higher authority of the *Times* newspaper itself. We quote, not from a file of old papers, but from a compendious little pamphlet published last year, under the title of “Suggestions for a Revision of the Prayer-book, with the opinions of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner), and the Bishops of St. Asaph (Short), Chester (Graham), and Limerick.”†

At pp. 12-14 of this tract we are furnished with a lengthy leader from the *Times* on the subject of auricular confession (as growing out of the celebrated Boyne Hill, and Mr. Poole

1861, on the subject of “getting over scruples.” See also the Rev. Christopher Nevile’s Letter to the *Stanford Mercury*, August, 1862.

* Those who wish to hear in full the objection taken to this form of words would do well to read Mr. Fisher’s argument at pp. 72-79, and p. 473, of his Second Edition.

† London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., Paternoster Row. 1860.

of St. Barnabas, cases of 1858-9), wherein the following passages occur :—

“ It is all very well to taunt the Bishop of Oxford, and the obnoxious clergymen whom he shelters beneath his episcopal ægis, with their diluted Protestantism; but it is not so easy to shake their assertion that the practices complained of are *positively enjoined by the Rubric and Ritual of the Church itself*. Evangelical combatants, when defeated on the Prayer-book, commonly sound a retreat upon the Bible; but the manœuvre won’t do. If the Bible and the Prayer-book teach the same thing, it is unnecessary to shift the ground of argument; if they do not, then one or the other must be abandoned. The question is, *how far does the Ritual of the Church of England lend its sanction to the practice of confession?* * What is the meaning of those words in the Ordination Service, ‘ Whose sins,’ &c.? It will not do to say merely these are scriptural expressions; we are entitled to know why they occur in that particular service, and what rational interpretation can be assigned to them. It is open for a controversialist to allege that they may apply literally to the Twelve Apostles, *without having been intended to apply to every young man who kneels before a bishop in the ceremony of ordination.*” †

I would continue the quotation, but as the pamphlet in which the passage occurs should be in the hands of every one interested in this question—and who is not?—I must

* “ It is well known that the Ritualist adheres firmly to the three following points, namely, the Real Presence, the Mass, and Confession. We Protestants look upon the first as a sad delusion; the second (composed as it is of several solemn religious views of Romish doctrine) we dare to call a frightful perversion of sacred truth; while the third tends to shock the senses by indelicate suggestions, and so draws the mind from its sense of decency, at the hazard of undermining its purity.”—THE CASE STATED, by WILLIAM PARKER, *Bourn, Lincolnshire*, 1878.

† The Rev. J. MacNaught, of St. Chrysostom’s, Liverpool, resigned his preferment in October, 1861, on this ground amongst others.

refer my readers to it. In order, however, to mark the change which has come o'er the spirit of the *Times* within the last few months, let me, in justice to the cause of Canon Wodehouse and the 463 clergy, beg attention to the following notable observations from the same place :—

"If the Prayer-book has become obsolete, why swear by it—why refuse to alter it? An attempt has been made to get through Parliament a measure for the Revision of the Prayer-book, but it failed through the opposition of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the scant support which it received from the members of the Church; and yet, after deciding to retain unaltered every letter and comma of the Book of Common Prayer, they *denounce, as Romish renegades, the men whose only fault is that they construe its directions literally*, and choose to practise what their impugnors profess.

"If these facts prove anything, it is that the popular theology and ordinary practice of the Church of England have developed themselves beyond the limits of its fixed Ritual. The result is sophistry, Jesuitism, and hypocrisy. Whether this is too much to pay for a merely traditional reverence for the past we need not undertake to determine."

Bravo, *Times*! I will not stay to inquire why the same paper now refuses admission to letter after letter sent to it by various members of the Church, advocating the issue of a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Liturgy; or, if admitted, follows them up with scoffs and sneers, as in the case of the Rev. John Kaye, of Riseholme.* But this at least we may be allowed to put on record, that the late act of Canon Wodehouse, in resigning his valuable preferments,† has effectually disposed of *one* of the feeble arguments

* Now the justly respected and exemplary Archdeacon of Lincoln (1878).

† In addition to many other examples which have occurred at various times, the following from the *Exeter Flying Post* (in reference to the resignation of the Rev. R. P. Cornish, January, 1862, in consequence of his inability to

of the *Times* for continuing things as they are; while at the same time it has given proof to the world that there is honesty and *consistency* in the Church, if not in certain portions of the public press. To this effect the defunct Canon still speaketh, and will speak; and his self-sacrifice will be still remembered when the heartless calumnies of the *Times* have met with the fate such things will always receive in the long run from a fair-judging and enlightened public.

I remain, Sir, yours, &c.,

Feb. 7, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXIV.

“COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE CHURCH” (BY A HIGH CHURCHMAN).

“Rarus enim ferme sensus communis in illâ.”—JUVENAL.

SIR,—Six, seven, eight, nine fresh pamphlets on the subject of Revision are at this moment lying before me. Their titles, which it would occupy too much space to copy, may

maintain his subscription to the formularies of the Established Church) is worth preserving:—

“By his resignation, Mr. Cornish sacrifices a considerable property, and his connexion with his parishioners, by whom he was most deservedly beloved. He was one of the most popular clergymen of the diocese. His liberality was unbounded. He was the foremost in every work, whether clerical or secular, which could forward the interests or the happiness of all classes. He was highly esteemed by his brother clergymen, and was diocesan inspector of schools. He was appointed to his cure, which is worth about £100 a year, in 1855. During his residence at Ivybridge he has built a picturesque parsonage, and the house and surrounding grounds display no ordinary taste. The amount which he expended upon these improvements, about £7,000, Mr. Cornish necessarily sacrifices by his resignation! He had, also, for some time endeavoured to erect a church in another part of the parish, which is widespread and insufficiently provided with church accommodation. Mr. Cornish’s departure was quite unexpected by the parishioners, and has been a heavy blow to them.”

be seen on the back of one of them,* just published by Messrs. Hodgson, Gough Square, Fleet Street.† To review them all in succession would be wearisome. To make a selection, where each has considerable merit, would be invidious. To lump them, as is done by the Quarterly and Monthly reviewers, would tax your columns to an extent which "Peter Ploughman" would doubtless resent.‡ What then is to be done? I see but one way of escape, which is fortunately supplied by the exceptional character of one of these publications.

The advocates for Liturgical Revision have been repeatedly taunted by their opponents (Lord Lyttelton, for example, in his late correspondence with Lord Ebury)§ with being one-sided; that is to say, with belonging almost exclusively to what is called the Low Church, or Evangelical party. To a certain extent, perhaps, this charge is true; so far, at least, as relates to the 463 clergymen signing the petition presented to the House of Lords last summer by Lord Ebury, who in so doing, however, it must be borne in mind, distinctly guarded himself against being held bound by all their requirements. But it is a mistake, or rather an "artful dodge" of the enemy,|| to assume that the movement is therefore

* The titles of upwards of 100 tracts published on the subject of Revision of the Prayer-book may be seen in the last Report of the "Association for Promoting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer and a Review of the Acts of Uniformity," 17, Buckingham Street, Adelphi.

† "Notes on a Declaration against a Revision of the Prayer-book."

‡ Alluding to a letter in *Bell's Weekly Messenger* under the above title, but bearing internal evidence of a very different authorship.

§ See Vol. I., Letter LIX., p. 362. The correspondence between the two noble lords is given in the *Guardian* of Sept. 7, 1859, and is a memorable example of religious controversy conducted in a gentlemanly and truly Christian spirit.

|| The same device was again resorted to by the opponents of Revision, in endeavouring to identify Lord Ebury with Messrs. Miall, Bright, &c. See article in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1862, on the Bicentenary of the Act of Uniformity of 1662.

confined to that body of men, however respectable and respected several of them may be.

As one proof, among many which might be given, of the truth of my words, I solve the embarrassment under which I now lie, of making a selection for the purpose of review from nine different pamphlets of almost equal merit, by deciding upon one bearing the title, “Common Sense about the Church, in a Letter to some of her Clergy. *By a High Churchman.*”*

This treatise, consisting of but twenty-four pages, and the price as many farthings, I most earnestly recommend to the attention of all moderate Churchmen, whether High, Low, or Broad; and, perhaps, I may be allowed to speak with some authority, having read, I believe, every tract (amounting to some fifty or sixty) that has appeared on this subject within the last five years.

The title may alarm at first sight, and give rise to the application of a certain familiar proverb about the bird and its nest. But is there not a cause? Is it not a fact that, at this moment, some thousands of the profession, to which I suppose the writer of the tract belongs, are exposing themselves by attaching their signatures to a document† which, while professing to resist Lord Ebury’s motion, has in reality armed him with one of his most unanswerable arguments in support of it?‡ Has it not been the means of

* London: Hatchard and Co., Piccadilly. 1860. A similar tract has been just published by Messrs. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street, bearing the title, “Common Sense for Clergymen. By one of themselves.” But whether a High Churchman or not we are not informed (1878).

† The numbers who ultimately signed the Westminster Manifesto were between 9,500 and 10,000.

‡ The great value to the cause of Revision of the celebrated “Declaration of the Clergy against Alteration of the Book of Common Prayer” consists in this, that it *proves a negative*—it proves that a majority of the clergy are *not* averse to such alteration, even “at this present time.”

eliciting most convincing replies from men who would otherwise have probably remained for ever silent? Has it not betrayed remarkably the weakness of its own position, by showing that, after all, a majority of the clergy are either *favourable* to Revision, or at least *not opposed* to it; while, even of those who have unadvisedly signed it, many declare that it is with them simply a question of *time*, not of principle?*

But we must hasten to notice the pamphlet before us; and allow this "High Churchman," faithful found among many faithless,† to speak a few words of "common sense" in the name of his brethren.

"I can only regard," says he — addressing the Very Reverend Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford (Dean Trench)— "the step you have taken by the issue of this circular, as a most mischievous and misguided effort to screen an unscrupulous party in this country, who, for the last twenty-five years, have been moving heaven and earth to revolutionise the Church of England, and to undo the work of the Reformation."‡

To prove this position, which is indeed a strong one, and

* See for example the letter of the Rev. Canon Stowell, published in the *Times*, February, 1860.

† Mr. A. Steuart, M.P. for Cambridge, resigned his seat for the borough in the autumn of 1862, on the ground that the High Church party were carrying matters to an extreme which he could not approve, and which he believed to be both unwise and inexpedient.

‡ "By the publication of Froude's *Remains* it appeared that one at least of the party had been actuated by an intense hatred of the Reformation and its authors; and the editors, one of whom was the Tractarian Coryphaeus, the Rev. J. H. Newman, at once brought upon themselves and their coadjutors a suspicion of being engaged in a systematic attempt to Romanise the Church of England; a suspicion which subsequent events have strongly tended to confirm."—BAXTER'S CHURCH HISTORY, chap. xv., p. 704. I feel here tempted to quote at length from an admirable pamphlet by the Rev. Bourchier Savile, entitled "Who shall Revise the Prayer-book?"—Longmans, 1877; but I prefer to call earnest attention to the tract itself.

demands *proof* before it can claim acceptance at the hands of an impartial public, the author sets forth the names of the principal parties to the Manifesto, dwelling in particular and with great force upon those of Archdeacon Denison, and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, of Frome ; from whom he passes by a natural and easy transition to the mention of Dr. Pusey, an extract from whose correspondence with Dr. Dodsworth will be read with interest, but is too lengthy for insertion here.

"These then," proceeds the High Churchman, "are this man's doctrines and practices. He has never denied them, though he has attempted to explain them away. Yet his name will no doubt figure conspicuously amongst the signatures to your Declaration.* He and the rest of the conspirators will be too ready to express their conviction that any attempt at the present time to alter the Book of Common Prayer will be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church."

Now, had these sentiments rested upon the authority of an anonymous writer alone, I should not have attached much importance to them, or expected your readers to do so. But that they are the embodiment of the feelings of many thousand members of the Church, who have not shrunk from expressing their mind both in public and in private, there can be no doubt. To which number may be added the recorded words of one who knew the party well, and was "not ignorant of their devices."

"The Newmanites," says Dr. Arnold,† "would not yet dare to admit that their religion was different from that of the New Testament ; but I am perfectly satisfied that it is so, and what they call ecclesiastical tradition contains things

* As it does, of course. See the list published by Messrs. Bell and Daldy, 1860.

† Life, by Stanley, Vol. ii. p. 100, "Letter to an Old Pupil," 1838.

wholly inconsistent with the doctrines of our Lord, of St. Paul, of St. Peter, and of St. John. . . . Whenever you see this party acting *as a party*, they are just like the Non-jurors—busy, turbulent, and narrow-minded; with no great or good objects, but something that is at best fantastic, and generally mischievous.”

How far these words, written in 1838, have since been verified, I leave to be judged by the recent proceedings at St. George’s-in-the-East, which have undeniably grown out of these beginnings.* The seed was, indeed, sown long ago, but this is the natural and predicted fruit of it. We owe much, therefore, to independent writers like Dr. Arnold, and the concealed “High Churchman,” for plucking off the mask from this hideous image, and exposing what lies behind so seemingly fair a front.

But what are we to say of men like Canon Stowell, Dr. M’Caul, and Daniel Wilson, whose names are found in most unexpected conjunction, on this occasion, with those of Bryan King, Liddell, Poole, Purchas, W. U. Richards, and others, pointed out and severely commented on by the “High Churchman?”† Never, I suppose, was there such a curious combination since the days of Daniel’s image of gold and iron, silver and brass artistically welded together, and exhibited to the admiring monarch standing unnaturally on feet of clay! And much shall we be astonished, if the fate of this modern amalgam be not like that in the Oriental vision—to crumble speedily to dust, and make way by its destruction for a wider diffusion of the genuine and comprehensive Church of the Gospel.

I must reserve any further remarks on this tract to my next. It is short, indeed, but consists of “thoughts that

* See Vol. I., Letters LXIV.—LXVI., pp. 379–399.

† See Appendix to “Common Sense,” &c. Nos. i., ii.

breathe, and words that burn," and is not lightly to be passed over in a single letter, as the production of any ordinary writer. Meanwhile I remain,

Yours, &c.,

Feb. 16, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXV.

A LIMITED OR UNLIMITED COMMISSION, THAT IS THE QUESTION.

"Specify what you want, and ask for a Royal Commission to do that and no more."—*Common Sense about the Church*, p. 14.

SIR,—The "High Churchman" next proceeds to comment upon the address of the 4,000 clergymen of the Church of England, presented some few years ago to Archbishop Sumner, respecting the Burial Service; and he asks, "What has now become of their former convictions? Has the grievous scandal of which they then complained been removed? Has the magnitude of the evil been diminished?*" Nothing of the kind; but the Romanisers among them have discovered that their craft is in danger. The rising indignation and disgust of the people has told upon their stubborn wills and struck terror into their guilty consciences. They tremble for the consequences, if the people really do take up the question. They know that honestly they have not a leg to rest upon in the sight of a British public. They are fully aware that if it were *now* to come to a stand-up fight in this country between Protestantism and their hybrid Popery,†

* The irritating revival from year to year of a "Burials Bill" in the House of Commons is one outcome of this persistent refusal to listen to the voice of "*Common Sense about the Church*."

† The title given to this Romanesque school by the author of "*Quousque*" is that of "*ULTRAMARINES*," as being "neither one thing nor another," while "*ultras*" every one will allow them to be.—*Quousque*, p. 2.

they and all their paraphernalia of Eucharistic vestments and Ecclesiastical buffoonery would inevitably go to the wall.”

These severe, but not altogether uncalled-for, remarks are elicited by the startling fact, that several names of High Churchmen who signed the “Burial Service Memorial” are now found attached to the Anti-Revision Declaration of Dean Trench and Co.; while “unhappily,” says our author, “many of the Evangelical body are too ready to make peace with them on dishonourable and dangerous terms.”—“Only give us *time*, say the former, and we shall have everything our own way in the Church. The next generation will be ours.”

We think, on the contrary, that *time* is telling *against* the movement so vehemently denounced in this tract. They have overshot their mark; and the reaction, always the result of an over-strained effort, has already begun to take effect: well if it do not land the Church ultimately in the regions of infidelity and scepticism.*

But we must hasten to what is, after all, the most material feature in the treatise before us, namely, the author’s scheme for supplying “WHAT IS WANTED” in the Church. “Specify,” says he, to the advocates for Revision, “specify what you want; and ask for a Royal Commission to do that, and no more.” This, with all deference, we think a weak point in our author’s tactics. It is, in fact, a mistake. It is playing the game of the enemy, and needlessly exposing the ranks of the Revisors to a desultory and harassing fusillade.

For example, look to the very first paragraph of this scheme: “Remove the scandal from the Burial Service, but

* The Bishop of London (Tait) attributed the origin of the notorious Essays and Reviews in great measure to the Tractarian Movement of 1835, and it cannot be denied that laxity of religious opinion has greatly increased since that date, and is still increasing.

leave the Athanasian Creed alone!" Here the "High Churchman" appears in his true colours.—Why *leave alone* that creed,

"Which doth your true believer so much please,"

but which most certainly creates a far greater prejudice against the Prayer-book than any expression in the Burial Service? * Would it not be wiser to follow the example of Bishop Tomline (whose authority as a sound Churchman has never, I believe, been disputed, and whose work has long been a text-book with students for holy orders), and acknowledge at once that "our Church would have acted more wisely and more consistently with its general principles

* As a practical proof of the assertion in the text, take the following as quoted from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Dec. 26, 1872:—

DEMONSTRATION AGAINST THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

Yesterday at *Norwich* a "demonstration" was made against the Athanasian Creed. The following handbill was distributed to the church-goers:—

"PEACE AND GOODWILL TO ALL MEN."

(Christmas Day, 1872.)

You are about to be called on to join in the Athanasian Creed as part of your worship.

The Bishop of Peterborough (can this be Magee?) has declared that the Creed "grates on his feelings whenever it is read. Does it not on yours?"

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Longley) declared in the presence of the whole bench of bishops, that no one accepts or believes in its terms as they now stand. Do you?

It is used by no other Church in public services as by ours.

Three thousand clergy, of all ranks and parties, have lately petitioned to be relieved from its use in public service.

It declares the damnation of millions of our fellow Christians who do not accept it.

It binds us, on the same awful peril to ourselves, to believe in that damnation of others.

It is a chief hindrance to many from joining our Church or from taking orders.

Protest by your silence or attitude against its violation of the spirit of this day, of our Church and of our Lord and Saviour, as always did the late Bishop of Lichfield (Lonsdale).

of mildness and toleration if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses?"* Why not admit boldly, with the peace-loving Simeon, that "if the same candour and moderation that are observable in other parts of the Liturgy had been preserved *here* it would have been better"?†

But hear the "High Churchman" speak again :—

"Be content with the Baptismal Service *as it is*, and as a recent judgment of the Judicial Committee has left it. Nearly 3,300 of the Clergy of the Church of England have expressed their satisfaction with that judgment."—Have they?—But even granting that they have, what are they among so many?—And is it not notorious to all—yes, even doubtless to the "High Churchman"—that one principal ground for demanding a Royal Commission is, with many, their dissatisfaction with this very service? and that to disallow them the hope of having it fairly considered, clause by clause, in connexion with the Catechism and Confirmation Service, would be to cut off from them their dearest wish, their "point of conscience," calling for relief, and upon which they strenuously insist?‡

* Elements of Christian Theology, Vol. ii., p. 222.

† *Horæ Homileticæ*, Vol. ii., p. 214. I cannot resist quoting the following at length from Mr. Savile's tract, already referred to at p. 25:—"No sooner had the United States of America succeeded in effecting its separation from the mother country, than the Episcopalian clergy took a step in the right direction by expelling the so-called Athanasian Creed from their Liturgy: an admirable deed, as no one, whose mind has not been warped by a system of ecclesiastical training, can for a moment accept the 'damnatory clauses' of this mis-called creed.

"Even the most violent Ritualist is compelled to put a non-natural construction upon these harsh anti-Christian sentiments (as the Archdeacon of Canterbury pointed out in Convocation), which are such a disfigurement to what otherwise might be accepted as a faithful embodiment of the great doctrine of the Trinity."—*Who shall Revise the Book of Common Prayer?* p. 24.

‡ Our knowledge of the Revision Movement of 1858-78, which is considerable, leads us to believe that more stress is laid by a certain party upon

I presume not to pronounce what might be, much less what should be, the decision of a Royal Commission upon this service; but I say with deliberation that to refuse it a place in the hearing—to shut the door of the Court against its entrance—would be with most of the Churchmen calling for Revision, and with almost the whole body of Dissenters, (whom we are not without faint hopes of conciliating,) to perform the play of the *Prince of Denmark* with the part of *Hamlet* omitted.

No; while we are about it, let us not give this handle to our enemies, by enabling them to say that we shrink from a full and complete examination into the Prayer-book, from beginning to end. Let us not do things by halves. Let us have that faith in what is true, to believe that it will stand the test of calm and reasonable inquiry; and let us not doubt but that there are in the Church at this moment a sufficient number of men, of clear and unprejudiced minds, to hear and determine all that may be brought before them, from all quarters, in this matter. To *limit* the powers of the Commission would be to destroy half its value*—to prejudice, in fact, the very questions it is asked to decide.

Those who, like the “High Churchman,” talk about a *limited Commission*, had better at once join issue with the amiable Dean of Norwich (Pellew), and accept his proposition, now standing for the consideration of Convocation.† But

an examination into the Baptismal Services, than upon all the other points put together, and unquestionably there is room here, as in other parts of the Prayer-book, for considerable improvement, even independently of the great *Regeneration Cruz*.

* And yet this is the very thing that was ill-advisedly done with the Commission of 1867-70.

† The Dean of Norwich’s motion, as ultimately submitted to Convocation, March 14, 1861, was as follows:—

“That the Upper House of Convocation be respectfully invited to concur with this House in a humble Petition to Her Majesty the Queen, that

to our mind it is altogether a fallacy to use such language, and only deceiving both ourselves and others.

No ; if we are to have a Commission at all, let it be free—free as the winds. Let it be free to hear, free to judge, free to report. Let its powers be simply restrained in the matter of *action*. Legislation is not for the few, but the many. Here, if it must be so, let Convocation have a voice, but not a *veto*. Alas, that the sound of that voice must always be received with misgivings so long as it is the muffled echo of but a part—not the whole—of the Church. Let the Parliament, then, as a matter of course, step in to determine, and the Crown finally set to its seal.

But let us not mar our whole work by setting about it

she will be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission, composed of Ecclesiastical persons, to consider whether the Book of Common Prayer may not be better adapted to the existing exigencies of the Church.

- 1st. By some modification of the Rubric, so as to dispense with certain repetitions which occur in the public services as at present used.
- 2ndly. By enlarging, and in some cases altering, the Table of appointed Lessons ; and especially assigning different Lessons for the Afternoon and Evening Services.
- 3rdly. By a re-arrangement of the Psalter.
- 4thly. By the use of but one Creed at each public service, and that one the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, except on Trinity Sunday, when that of St. Athanasius may be read.
- 5thly. By allowing the officiating Minister, at his discretion, to transfer the Litany, or that portion of the Communion Service which is usually read on Sundays, from the Morning to the Afternoon or Evening Services ; and
- 6thly. By the addition of certain Prayers or Services for seasons of humiliation, or of thanksgiving ; for a blessing on our home and foreign missions ; for prisoners, and for various other special occasions. *The Commission to be strictly required to confine its deliberations to the above points, and to such others as may be specially submitted to it by the Queen's authority : and on no account whatever to interfere with the doctrines of the Church, as contained in her Articles, Canons, and Liturgy.*—Substance of a Speech, &c., by the Hon. and Very Rev. George Pellew, Dean of Norwich. Hatchard, 1861.

with hands tied, and fetters on our feet.* No solid or permanent good can ever come from such a mode of proceeding. The admitted sore points in the Church would be but thinly skinned over. The rankling ulcer would yet remain, and presently burst out afresh. A cure, to be effectual, must be radical; or at least we must show that all has been attempted that wisdom, kindness, and skill combined could suggest, to effectuate relief.

We must now take leave of the "High Churchman," with whom, though differing upon the two points noted in this letter, we in the main agree: and we once more commend his twenty-four pages to all well-wishers to the cause of Liturgical Reform.

Yours, &c.,

Feb. 28, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXVI.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE, THE HON. AND RIGHT REV.

HENRY MONTAGU VILLIERS.—NO. I.

"It is bad enough for ladies to pull caps, but still worse for bishops to pull mitres."—SYDNEY SMITH'S *Works*, Vol. ii., p. 4.

SIR,—I am not prepared to say that the witty Canon's idea of combatant bishops is realised in the picture I am about to exhibit to my readers to-day. On the contrary,

* A reference to the Commission of 1689 will show how impossible it is to *limit* the powers of any which should now issue, consistently with the nature of the work to be done.

The Commission was addressed, Sept. 17, 1689, to Lamplugh, Archbishop of York, and nine other bishops, six deans, four professors and doctors (two from Cambridge, two from Oxford), four archdeacons, and six of the London clergy; nine (or more) of them, whereof three to be bishops, to form a quorum. See Return made to Mr. Heywood's motion by order of the House of Commons, June 2, 1854.—*Parliamentary Paper*, No. 283.

as might be anticipated from the birth and other antecedents of the Bishop of Carlisle,* we have in him a model of Christian courtesy and good breeding; and the document on which our present article is founded† partakes in all respects of these excellent recommendations. Yet, for all this, it has the undoubted effect of suggesting to a sprightly imagination the manner in which such a scene as that supposed by Sydney Smith *would* have taken place if such a thing were possible.

The bishop has addressed a REPLY to certain clergy of his diocese, who had memorialised him on the subject of a Revision of the Liturgy, expressing their desire (in common with several of their brethren elsewhere) to hand down intact to their children “the precious inheritance they had received from their forefathers,” at the same time affirming their conviction that “*any attempt* at the present time to alter the Book of Common Prayer would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church.”

The Reply to this Address is, after the approved fashion of Queen’s Speeches to her Parliament, an echo in great measure of the document itself; signifying his lordship’s sympathy with the memorialists’ veneration towards our Prayer-book, a sense of thankfulness that we have such a treasure, and a determination to be not slack in his exertions to transmit the torch to the next generation, undiminished in lustre by passing through his hands.

But here the bishop interposes an amendment to the Address, which he carries unanimously in his “own little court” by the aid of three powerful allies—common sense, liberality, and fearlessness of giving offence.

* Translated to Durham, June, 1860; died August, 1861.

† Reply of the Lord Bishop of Carlisle (Villiers) to an Address on the subject of the Revision of the Liturgy from the Rev. L. Jefferson, Rural Dean, and the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Kirkby Stephen in the county of Westmoreland. February, 1860.

He tells the clergy of the rural deanery of Kirkby Stephen, and through them the clergy of his whole diocese—let us hope, also, the clergy of some other dioceses—that this torch, after passing through so many hands, may possibly require trimming; that, unless from time to time miraculously renewed, the purest olive oil will not burn bright for ever; and that it is hard on the present runners in the race of life if they may not be allowed occasionally to dress their lamp, as their forefathers did before them.

To quit the metaphor (which I am not aware of having seen applied before in elucidation of our well-worn thesis), let us hear the bishop speak for himself; for truly his words will bear repetition as well as those of any of his right reverend brethren who have hitherto been heard on the subject.

“The question (says his lordship) which must arise to the mind of every thoughtful Churchman, anxious to see the stakes strengthened and the cords lengthened, is, *how can the greatest number of England's people be brought within the pale of England's Church?* I mean consistently with her fully maintaining the truth committed to her charge. It is not a clerical question more than that of a layman. It concerns the Church at large—the laity and the clergy alike. The answer may be found in the spirit of the Preface* to the Prayer-book itself, ‘It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting, any variation from it.’”

Strange that a sentiment, worthy of being written in letters of gold, should have ceased to have weight with so

* The author of this Preface is generally allowed to have been the excellent Bishop Sanderson, of Lincoln, formerly Rector of Boothby Pagnell, the adjoining parish to Ingoldsby.

many who still dwell with complacency on the obverse side of the picture, representing a view of “the factious, peevish, and perverse spirits,” who will “be satisfied with nothing that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves.”

The bishop proceeds, in a calm and dignified tone, to allay the fears of the memorialists as to the impossibility of conducting a Revision upon any other principle than that of disturbing the whole existing order and machinery of the Prayer-book. I must, however, refer my readers to the document itself, which has been extensively circulated throughout the kingdom, and is a powerful set-off against the counter demonstration of the Westminster Divines. It is full of sound sense and just conclusions; and breathes the spirit of a large and comprehensive Christianity, which, while mourning over that which is defective in our system, would retain and consolidate that which is good.

Take the following of many paragraphs which space obliges me most reluctantly to pass over:—

“In dealing with the Revision of the Liturgy, we must look to the state of the National Church at large. What are we compelled to witness? Not the calm and simple method of carrying on Divine Worship in the Sanctuary which characterised our Church service in the days of our youth—a calmness and simplicity which was as compatible with fervent devotion as it was agreeable to the Protestant tone of the Liturgy of our Reformed Church. If it were not so, I would still say it is wise and right ‘*quicquid non movere.*’ But we find in these days a parish church the scene of uproar disgraceful to us as Churchmen—nay, more, disgraceful to us as Englishmen. . . . I find a people irritated by the introduction of customs which, if legal, had at any rate become obsolete. I find the bishop of the diocese unable to control the use or the abuse of forms and ceremonies; and I am persuaded that such scenes within the

sacred buildings, such weakness on the part of the Heads of the Church (the law at present giving them no power to interfere), and such bitterness of language used on all sides, are altogether undermining the affections of the laity towards the Church. I fear the result must be serious and lasting injury to the cause, not of the Church of England only, but of the great Head of the Church, even our Lord Jesus Christ himself." *

What then does the Bishop of Carlisle advise in such a condition of affairs, which it is equally impossible to deny or to defend? Does he join with the rest of his right reverend brethren, as represented in the Convocation House of Westminster, through their unchallenged mouthpiece the Bishop of Oxford, in protesting against *all attempts* to amend the forms which govern our Church, and "*agreeing entirely in the prayer*" of certain clergymen "that the Church might be spared all the suffering, and danger, and discord which *might be the result* of doing anything that might shake that marvellous composition, the compiling of which the Spirit of God has so manifestly traced—the Reformed Book of Common Prayer of our Church?" †

No! Bishop Villiers has read, in a Book of higher authority than "the Reformed Book of Common Prayer," that "God is not the author of *confusion*, but of *peace* in all churches of the saints;" and he cannot believe that "the Spirit of God" ever "traced" those lines in our formularies

* "Can anything be more distinctly *antichristian* than the recent acts of the condemned Mr. Toth of Hatcham? Even the *Guardian* of Jan. 3, 1877, admits that he is guilty of having violated his most solemn oaths."—B. W. Savile, on "Who shall Revise the Prayer-book?" p. 25.

† See the Bishop of Oxford's Speech before Convocation on Thursday, Feb. 16, 1860, on presenting a petition against a Revision of the Prayer-book, there being present the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner), the Bishops of St. David's, Lincoln, Norwich, Bath and Wells, Salisbury, Bangor, Llandaff, and Chichester.—*English Churchman*, Vol. xviii., p. 179.

which have led to “all the suffering, and danger, and discord,” which have for years been distracting the Church in certain portions of these realms, and are at this moment requiring the bâtons of three or four hundred policemen Sunday by Sunday, at one spot in our great metropolis, to prevent their breaking out into acts of violence, if not of bloodshed.*

No! The Bishop of Carlisle’s method of meeting this state of things is not, like his brother’s of Oxford, to “cry peace when there is no peace;” but he feels compelled to ask himself “WHAT CAN BE DONE?” and he proceeds forthwith, like one placed in authority *for that very purpose, if for any purpose at all*, to look out for a remedy by removing the root of the complaint.† This he does in the only sensible way that it can be done, by going at once to the “*fons et origo mali*,” the unreformed portion of our Book of Common Prayer—that is to say, that portion of it which TIME alone has now caused to be as much in need of reformation as other parts were 200 or 300 years ago, as then wisely felt by our forefathers, and still more wisely altered and amended, according to the requirements of the age in which they lived; while, with equal wisdom and forethought for the future, they left us the wholesome piece of advice quoted by the bishop, to “go and do likewise.”

Taking leave for to-day of this most timely and interesting address, which I meanwhile recommend to the perusal of the clergy through the length and breadth of the land,

I remain, yours, &c.,

March 8, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

* As many as 400 policemen were on one occasion required to keep the peace during public worship at St. George’s-in-the-East. (Vol. I., p. 388.)

† How many thousands of pounds, spent in fruitless and vexatious litigation, might have been spared, if this wise advice of Bishop Villiers had been acted on by those in authority twenty years ago! Is it yet too late?

LETTER LXXVII.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE ON REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

NO. II.

“Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more.”

SHAKESPEARE (Henry V.).

SIR,—However much it may delay our treating of other recent publications on the subject before us—and their name is legion—I am unwilling to dismiss so important a document as that put forth by the Bishop of Carlisle, without devoting to it one more of these passing notices.

It is scarcely possible to overrate the value of such an enunciation of just and liberal views upon Church matters at this crisis, by one holding the high position of the author. If for nothing else, it is most useful as an encouragement to the many thousand clergy* who *secretly* or openly favour Lord Ebury’s proposition, by showing them that there is *one* at least of their spiritual guides who sympathises with them in their difficulties, recognises the reasonableness of their demand, and is neither ashamed nor afraid to declare publicly that he does so.

It had been hitherto supposed that the donning of the episcopal purple had the effect of fastening a padlock on the lips of the wearer, who became from that day forth of one mind and colour with the rest of his right reverend brethren.† The Bishop of Carlisle has proved himself a noble exception to this rule;‡ and his word in season will have the more weight, as the urgency of the occasion cannot be slight which

* Amounting, as it would now appear, to above half of the entire body.

† See Vol. I., Letter xxxi., p. 206.

‡ The present Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring) is another.

has led to so glaring a breach of traditionary and immemorial etiquette among the hierarchy.

“*What, then, is to be done?*” asks this practical legislator.

In answer to which question, he, in the first place, recapitulates a few of the expedients which have at various times suggested themselves to various people.

The bishops *might* agree (if that were a thing at all probable) upon a form of address to the clergy—they *might* recommend moderation—they *might attempt* to expound the law according to the best of their knowledge and judgment—

But, of each of these suggestions the bishop concludes the effect would be mere *brutum fulmen*—“*vox et præterea nihil.*”

Who, for example, would be insane enough to “attempt” a further interpretation of the ecclesiastical law, after the conflicting judgments in the Gorham case on the one hand, and the St. Paul’s, Knightsbridge, case on the other? What prelate would again undertake the thankless task of preaching “moderation” to his clergy, after the reception given to his diocesan’s admonitions by the infatuated rector of St. George’s-in-the-East?

As a last resource, therefore, in reply to the question of *what is to be done*, Bishop Villiers replies, LET THE PRAYER-BOOK BE REVISED. Let the axe be laid to the root of the tree. Don’t stand for ever upon paltry peddling expedients, unworthy the name of legislation—altering here a rubric, there a canon*—but submit the whole case to a thorough and efficient investigation.

“However great our desire may be to hand down the Book of Common Prayer intact to our children, it is clearly

* The miserable policy of “bit by bit legislation” has been fully exposed by the recent attempt to repeal the 29th Canon.

not illegal or dishonest to sanction *some change*. To say that I give my assent and consent, and yet to say that there are points connected with our Common Prayer-book which admit of improvement, is not inconsistent.* To shut our eyes to what is going on around us—to close our ears to what is being said on these subjects—is puerile.”

That the bishop is here but echoing the voice of those who have said the same thing before him for the last five or six years, is no disparagement to his lordship’s wisdom. “A position of great responsibility makes a man timid.”† It is not surprising, therefore, that bishops should not put themselves in the front rank of a movement of this nature. But neither should they be wanting to themselves and the Church when they see the movement advancing in spite of them. To be indifferent in such a case is only to bring upon themselves contempt and odium; while it rather advances than retards the cause which is being borne forward on the tide of public opinion. We hail, therefore, this conspicuous accession to the ranks of the Reformers, and trust the example may be followed by others similarly situated.

But then says the bishop to his north-country memorialists, adopting the cuckoo-note of their southern brethren:

“Your address lays great stress upon the impropriety of touching the Common Prayer-book *at the present time*.”

Our readers are but too familiar with this unhappy phrase. But we must still further tax their patience to hear the bishop’s reply to this, to so many minds conclusive, argument:—

* And yet it is just this difficulty which has led to the late resignation of their preferments by Messrs. Wodehouse, MacNaught, Cornish, Nevile, and several others. Who can say how many are *kept altogether from entering the profession* by the same scruple? See Letter LXXIII., p. 18.

† Letter of the Rev. John Kaye, of Riseholme. 1860. Now Archdeacon of Lincoln (1878). See Letter LXXIII., p. 21.

“While I sympathise with my brethren in the wish that we could see the Common Prayer-book handed down intact to our children, *I differ from them as to the fact of the present time being so unsuitable for revision. I am more afraid of delay than I am of action.* There is excitement enough to make men take up the subject in earnest,* but I do not think there is so much excitement as that party spirit will blind men’s eyes, and a violent partisanship destroy their zeal for truth.”

His lordship quotes in support of his views no less an authority than the Bishop of Oxford! Tell it not in Gath; whisper it not in Askelon. Yes; the BISHOP OF OXFORD has discovered, “after having thought over the matter, that *this is a time* in which to be bold is to be wise—to be bold is to be safe.”†

To this testimony we may add the published sentiments of another Master in Israel: not indeed a bishop—*because* he has been a consistent Church Reformer for a quarter of a century—but not the less an authority for all that.

The Rev. Charles Girdlestone‡ writes as follows, in reply to the circular of the Westminster Divines:—

“TO THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER (TRENCH).

“DEAR SIR,—In reply to a circular, signed by yourself and others, inviting me to join in deprecating a revision of the Prayer-book ‘at the present time,’ I take the liberty of asking

* When, except in times of comparative excitement, are any reforms undertaken? The Revolution in France carried the English Reform Bill of 1831–2. The Potato Famine in Ireland accomplished the long-agitated Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846–7.

† It is on this principle, we suppose, that the Bishop of Oxford sets the example to his clergy of a breach of the Act of Uniformity. See opinions of Messrs. Jebb and Stephens, on a case put by Mr. Henry Seymour, M.P. for Poole, August 16, 1862.

‡ Of this gentleman see more in Vol. I., Letter xxxii., pp. 209–13.

at what time, past or future, you and they would judge it more expedient than now? *For my own part, I think the present the best time that ever was or ever will be.* My reasons for so thinking are as follow :—First, it never was so obvious as now that our Liturgy, in its present state, admits of being interpreted in harmony with that spurious Christianity called Popery, against which the Church of these realms is pledged to protest. Secondly, the danger never was so imminent as now, that if temperate revision be frustrated, we shall have in its stead a sweeping revolution. For such a calamity I dare not in anywise make myself responsible by signing the proposed declaration.”

Let us hope that, at the mouth of these three witnesses—the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Carlisle, and the Rector of Kingswinford—this word may henceforth be looked upon as established, and that we shall hear no more of the argument drawn from that stereotyped phrase, “not at this time.”

In conclusion, the Right Rev. Montagu Villiers signifies his intention of supporting “any temperate proposition that may be made for the removal of existing difficulties.”* More than this ; he adds—

“If a *Commission* were appointed to examine and report upon the question of Rubrics, *I do not feel that I could deny the propriety of the step.* But I shall offer the strongest resistance in my power to any attempt to force changes in the spirit of party ; or to make changes for mere love of change ; or to any narrowing of the basis of the Church of England, so as to exclude men who are prepared to say they honestly and *ex animo* can give in their adhesion to the doctrines of the

* His lordship, nevertheless, was silent in the House of Lords when Lord Ebury made his motion of May 8, 1860. Such, alas, is the wide difference between words and deeds. “Don’t mind what he *says* :—look to what he *does*,” said the present Lord Derby (when Foreign Secretary) of the Emperor of Russia (according to *Punch* !). This deponent sayeth true.

Thirty-nine Articles in the true, usual, and literal meaning of the said Articles; not putting their own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but taking it in the literal and grammatical sense."

That such a COMMISSION may speedily issue is the earnest prayer of

Yours, &c.,

March 13, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXVIII.

"THE CHURCH CAUSE AND THE CHURCH PARTY."

"High Church and Low Church,
Is a Church and no Church."—ANON.

SIR,—The above are the title and motto of a tract of some fifty pages recently reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer*,* in which allusion is made to Lord Ebury's threatened motion, now become the *bête noire* of the High Church PARTY.

I don't like the word. We don't read in the New Testament of Christ's party, or Paul's party: at least, if we do read of the latter, it is only in order to be emphatically condemned by the adopted leader. "Every one says, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided?"—And if not Christ, why his Church? Why these divisions and sub-divisions?—High and low, narrow and broad, Catholic and Evangelical;—this man after the use of Salisbury, with its dogma of Apostolic succession;† that man after the use of Exeter, with its dogma of Baptismal Regeneration; a third after the use of

* London: Mozley, Paternoster Row, 1860.

† See Vol. I., Letter LXI., p. 369.

Oxford, with its dogmas of private Confession and Priestly Absolution ?

Not that we anticipate that millennium of "*one use*" which the enthusiastic writer of the article before us seems to have pictured to his mind's eye ; wherein "the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, and Canterbury should worship together at the same altar, and separatists flock in by shoals to the one true Church."—"Happy dreams," indeed !—But we do believe, and are confident, that much might be done to widen those portals which now manifestly increase, if they do not *cause*, separation ; and we therefore hail Lord Ebury's proposition as directly tending to this consummation so devoutly to be wished.

The writer of the tract, whose style savours strongly of the classical language and well-known sentiments of the late M.P. for Maidstone* (and who, being now released for a season from his parliamentary engagements, doubtless finds more leisure for the use of his pen), characterises Lord Ebury's movement as one whose object is "to expunge Church doctrine from the Prayer-book," citing in support of such view the petition of the 463 clergy which Lord Ebury circulated last autumn amongst the London churchwardens.

Now, it is no part of our business to defend Lord Ebury. But we have said before, and we repeat it, that if every Member of Parliament is to be bound by every petition he presents, you will either get no petitions presented at all, or you will convert your representatives into mere nominees of so many cliques, instead of being, as they are theoretically supposed to be, free to hear and determine, to the best of their judgment, upon each point in debate as it arises.

But, *supposing* Lord Ebury to have stated it as his

* Alexander Beresford Hope. See Vol. I., Letter XLVII., pp. 306-7.

opinion that "the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick," for example, had better be omitted from our Prayer-book;* what of that?—Has no bishop done the same? We shall quote an authority which the (supposed) author of our tract will not readily reject—as the same writer was a decided advocate for those church decorations in which the ex-member for Maidstone takes so much delight, and in which his pure soul sees nothing but "the beauty of holiness," though weaker minds are apt to pervert them to purposes of idolatry and superstition :—

What says the late Bishop Stanley on the point which is now charged against a Lay Peer as a proof of his desire to "expunge Church doctrine from the Prayer-book?"

"With reference to the retention and losing of sins, unless a qualified interpretation and *considerable latitude* be generally understood, we, the clergy of the Reformed Protestant Church, *assume a right of tremendous responsibility, more becoming the character of the Roman Catholic priesthood*, in saying that unless we, as ministers of the Church, do forgive and absolve, the sins of the dying man must descend with him to the grave with all their fearful pressure; and that if we choose to retain them, he cannot escape their fearful consequences."†

I am aware that it is the fashion with the "party" to which our assumed author belongs to decry such writers as Arnold and Stanley; but we are by no means, therefore, persuaded that these latter are wrong, and that all wisdom lies with the doctors of the High Church school. That Bishop Stanley was successful as a practical administrator of the affairs of his diocese, stands on record in the words of one‡

* See "The Church Cause and the Church Party," p. 55.

† Bishop Stanley, of Norwich, "Notes on Subscription," 1840, p. 111.

‡ See a Sermon, entitled "The Faithful Steward," preached at the funeral

who can hardly be considered a partial witness; yet whose simple narrative over the grave of the departed drew tears from the eyes of many, who we fear would have been hardly moved to equal expressions of grief at the bier of a prelate who stood tenaciously upon his power to retain sins, or gloated with holy fervour on the "certainty of everlasting damnation" to all those who keep not "whole and undefiled the Catholic faith."

Sure we are that if every bishop were formed after the model of the late Bishop Stanley, the Church at large would fare never the worse. And if Lord Ebury is but treading in the steps of such a man in propounding his contemplated reforms in the Prayer-book, he cannot greatly err.

For the rest, we commend the article in the *Christian Remembrancer* to the attention of all who are interested in the rise and progress of "the Church Cause" in this country. We are as great advocates for that cause as is the writer of the paper in question. But while he sees, in the apathy with which Lord Ebury's motion is received by "the Church party," symptoms of a decline in the "Cause;" we, on the other hand, see, or fancy we see, in the earnestness with which it is supported by others, symptoms of a REVIVAL and new energy in the Church. To our judgment the Church of England has not a better friend than the noble lord; and though, doubtless, the ex-member for Maidstone will exclaim, and be echoed by sweet voices from Frome, Taunton, Cuddesdon, and Salisbury, "Save us from such friends,"* we venture to predict that the day will come (possibly not till after the removal of the prophet from amongst us) that the zeal of the noble lord in his holy cause will meet with its due acknowledgment at the hands of a grateful nation.

of the Right Rev. Edw. Stanley, Bishop of Norwich, by Dean Pellew, Sept. 23, 1849.

* The *English Churchman* of Nov., 1861, observes:—"The Ingoldsby gilding leaves the *Ebury pill* as objectionable as ever."

Then—when some future chronicler shall pronounce the praises of the “impulsive” Church Reformer, speaking of him as he is, neither more nor less than the simple truth—then shall even the uncompromising author of “The Church Cause and the Church Party” be constrained to admit, wiping the tear of affection from his eye—

“Whom I most hated living, thou hast made me,
With thy religious truth and modesty,
Now in his ashes honour; PEACE BE WITH HIM.”

I remain, yours, &c.,

March 20, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXIX.

AQUILA DE RUPE, IN A SERIES OF LETTERS TO LORD EBURY.

“Though he inherit
Nor the pride nor ample pinion
That the Theban eagle bear,
Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deep of air,
Yet shall he mount, and keep his distant way,
Beyond the limits of a vulgar fate.” GRAY.

SIR,—The writer of the above letters, under the title of “Aquila,” has a keen eye to spy out the defects in our Liturgy, and has used a quill from his own wing to set them before the public in a pamphlet of sixty odd pages.* We regret that he has seen fit to conceal his name. Whatever his modesty may suggest, sure we are that neither Lord Ebury, to whom the letters are addressed, nor any one who may chance to read them, will see anything in them whereof the writer needed to be ashamed.†

* “Liturgia Recusa; or, Suggestions for Revising and Reconstructing the Daily and Occasional Services of the Church.” London: 1860.

† The author is now known to have been the late Rev. Richard Bingham, of

But, alas ! there is such a thing as writing on certain subjects with “a rope about your neck;”* and if, as we more than suspect, the author of these pages is a poor clergyman, whose virtue and talents have been for thirty or forty years “*their own*” and their only “reward,” we can well understand how he fears to state under his proper signature that “the Prayer-book *needs*, might have, and must have, considerable amendments”—when the bishops are said to have declared “unanimously” that the said Prayer-book shall not be touched in their day.†

Well, time will show at last whether the Revisionists or the Prelates are to prevail. Meanwhile, let us congratulate ourselves that we have *other* champions with eagle eyes, eagle wings, and eagle spirits, who are not chained to the rock, like our friend, but able to utter notes of freedom unrestrained by those fetters, “which poverty’s unconquerable bar” still forges for the dependent in this world, however deserving of a better fate.

These letters are nine in number, and treat of the following questions with regard to the Liturgy :—

“What it might be well to do.”

“What has been done before.”

“Why the same should not be done again, and at once.”

“What ought to be done.”

“What may be done.”

“What must be done,” “might be done,” and “something more besides.”—

Ending with the appropriate motto, “Well begun, half

Queenborough, Kent, Secretary to the Association for Promoting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer; 17, Buckingham Street, Strand. He died at Sutton, Surrey, Jan. 22, 1872, æt. 74: a remarkable instance of neglected worth under three successive archbishops.

* See Vol. I., Letter LII., p. 334.

† See Vol. I., Letter XXXII., p. 213.

done ;”—a motto which had our legislators, lay and clerical, acted upon when first Lord Ebury broached this subject in the House of Lords, how much mischief would have been avoided—how much frivolous and vexatious obstruction spared ! We might by this time have handled our “*Liturgia Recusa*” in peace, and the Church been at work in earnest, instead of still shivering on the brink of that river into which it is its inevitable destiny to have to plunge at the last.

To enter in detail into Aquila’s nine letters is, of course, out of the question ; so we shall rush at once *in medias res*, and present our readers with the pith of the pamphlet, as condensed in the fourth, fifth, and sixth letters.

What, then, *ought* to be done ?—“*Destroy it not,*” says Aquila, and so say we, “*for a blessing is in it.*” But may it not be repaired and improved ?—This is an old story ; but it is clothed in such elegant language by our author, that we shall give his words in their entirety :—

“That the Liturgy of our Church has proved a great boon to thousands, there can be no reasonable question, and it would be folly and cruelty, I had almost said great wickedness, to annul it. But to amend, to modify, to reconstruct, and to strengthen, is not to destroy. Who are the real destructives—the men who repair, restore, and beautify the old buildings, or those who let them utterly alone, and suffer them to be consumed by the fangs of Time ?

“It is remarkable that the greatest opponents of Liturgical Revision are amongst the most energetic in church restoration. Oh that they had power *pro hac vice* in the parish where I write ! How soon would they level to the ground the high, ugly, awkward square pews, and refit the interior with new seats, without doors, or with very short ones ! What a change the chancel and the communion rails would undergo, even if they eschewed sedilia, a stone altar,

and a credence table! The font too,—very old indeed, and, alas! so abundantly churchwardened with coats of whitey-brown paint—how neatly it would be scraped and cleaned by the patient hand of some skilful *reviser* yeleft a mason, bringing out to the light of day the beautiful Purbeck, and exchanging the daubery of Goths and Vandals for Nature's workmanship!

“Now, why is it reasonable and proper to restore our cathedrals and churches after the lapse of years, rendering them more comely for the service of Almighty God, and more comfortable for worshippers, and at the same time *unreasonable* to correct and amend the form of words in which as hearers, inquirers, or believers, we approach the throne of grace? Why should not that which holds good with regard to the places in which we worship, hold good also in respect of the formularies we employ?”

Is it possible—yes, it is possible, strange, passing strange—that men, like the ex-member for Maidstone, can be so blind as not to see the gross inconsistency of their conduct in this respect! Yet, so it is. The material building shall have hundreds and thousands of pounds* continually spent upon it, in order to make it a fit habitation for the Being whose temple is all space; while the accumulated dust of two or three centuries shall still be allowed to deform the spiritual edifice—the work not made with hands—the manual of devotion for the faithful, co-extensive with the four quarters of the globe.

This, says Aquila (and so say we), is “what *ought* to be done:” clear the rubbish, brush away the dust, clean the floor, renew the varnish, polish the Purbeck, scrape off the plaster, pick out the thick coatings of churchwarden paint;—

* No one could be more liberal in this respect, to his honour be it spoken, than Mr. Alexander Beresford Hope.

in other words, restore without altering, cleanse without destroying, purify without damaging. To this I believe there are thousands of the clergy, and millions of the laity, who would willingly give their "assent and consent," if they could be assured that the work of renovation should rest here, and proceed no further.

But then comes the "*periculosæ plenum opus aleæ*," propounded by our author in his fifth and sixth chapters, under the heading of "What *may* and *must* be done." Ay, there's the rub! *May be done*, indeed; a great many things, no doubt, *may* be done. We *may*, for instance, "expunge all Church doctrine from the Prayer-book," says the writer of "The Church Cause and the Church Party."* We *may* insert new prayers and new collects, as was done in 1689, says the Bishop of Salisbury. We *may* so reconstruct our new Prayer-book, says Lord Lyttelton, that it shall become the shibboleth of a party, and not the *vox totius ecclesiæ*.

Whether such is the aim or not of our author, I leave your readers to judge for themselves from a perusal of this portion of his work, which treats, amongst other delicate matters, of the Baptismal and Burial Services, Absolution, the Ordinal, Catechism, Confirmation, and, generally, of the Occasional Services of the Church.

This branch of the subject is far too wide to be handled at the close of one of these letters, and the present one has already reached its full bounds.

Suffice it to say that Aquila does not conceal his *opinions* upon these matters, though he withholds his name; and, for right or for wrong, he speaks as he thinks. Commending his volume to the notice of your readers, and hoping that the time is approaching when it shall not be thought treason for the clergy to write *what they think* upon matters on which

* See last Letter, p. 46.

they *ought* to be better informed than others, and therefore most at liberty to speak their thoughts freely and unreservedly,

I remain, yours, &c.,

March 22, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXX.

THOUGHTS ON THE LITURGY. BY THE REV. PHILIP GELL, M.A.

“Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi;
Atque idem jungat lepores et mulgeat hircos.”—VIRGIL, ECL.

SIR,—Several reasons have concurred to postpone from week to week our notice of a tract,* bearing the above title, which has drawn down upon the head of its author the wrathful indignation of several High Church writers.

Those of my readers who are familiar with Mr. Fisher’s “Liturgical Purity”† will understand what they may expect to find in Mr. Gell’s fifty-six pages, from the following paragraph in his Preface:—

“I close with referring the reader for a full view of the whole subject to Mr. Fisher’s admirable book. Most of my suggestions to which any degree of importance may be attributed will there be found far more justly and forcibly set forth; and, if any of them have originally, and very long ago, had place in my mind, I should never have brought them out *but for the crisis which that work has introduced.*”

Now, without wishing to detract from whatever merit may be due to Mr. Fisher’s work—and it is far from incon-

* “The Difficulties of an Honest and Conscientious Use of the Book of Common Prayer, considered as a Loud and Reasonable Call for the only Remedy—Revision.” By the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A., sometime Rural Dean and Minister of St. John’s, Derby. London: 1860. (Died 1870.)

† London: Hamilton and Adams, 1860. Second Edition.

siderable—or to dispute the “originality” of our present author’s “thoughts” on the same subject, however long ago they may have been entertained, we are not prepared to admit that *the present crisis* has been brought about by either the one or the other. We believe that, next to the fact of Lord Ebury’s having made it a Parliamentary question (which in our judgment is the *primum mobile* of the whole),* “the crisis” owes more to the folly of a certain party in the Church, attempting to revive what the common consent of Englishmen had long since consigned to oblivion, as Popish or obsolete, than to any active measures from any quarter to obtain a removal or modification of certain doubtful expressions in the Prayer-book.

Messrs. Gell and Fisher, we suspect, might have written books by dozens, and pamphlets by scores, and have met with purchasers for neither the one nor the other,† had it not been for the timely encouragement of Messrs. Poole and West, Denison and Randall, Cheyne and Bryan King, Purchas and Mackonochie. These be thy gods, O Israel! Let honour be given where honour is due. Let the chaplet be placed on the right brow. Let the palm for bringing about “the present crisis” be ceded fairly to these well-disciplined athletes from the Oxford training school.‡

Read Mr. Gell’s brief table of contents, contrasting re-

* See before, Letter LXXII., p. 14.

† Even the celebrated “Essays and Reviews” did not reach a Second Edition until the train was set on fire by the unanimous protest of the Bishops. The Bishops of Bangor, Exeter, and St. David’s (Bethell, Philpotts, Thirlwall) have proved Mr. Fisher’s best friends, by their condemnation of his work.

‡ It is true the excitement of 1859-60 has now in great measure passed away, but the stimulus it gave to the cry for Revision was then very great, and the germ of the mischief still remains. The fire, in fact, is only smouldering on its embers, and keeps breaking out afresh from time to time in divers places; witness the Hatcham case of 1877-8.

markably with Mr. Davis's, whom he follows on the same line, though in a somewhat different style :—

“The difficulties occasioned by the language concerning Absolution.

“The Words of Consecration and Ordination.

“The Real Presence and the effect of Baptism ; as taught in the Catechism.

“The difficulties of the Baptismal Office and Confirmation.”

Is not the present excitement upon these matters to be distinctly traced to the justly-aroused popular indignation in the neighbourhood of West Lavington, East Brent, Boyne Hill, St. Paul's Knightsbridge, St. Barnabas Pimlico, Margaret Street Chapel, St. George's-in-the-East, St. Mary Magdalene Munster Square, St. Alban's Holborn, St. James' Hatcham, and the like?

The ministers, believe me, of these strongholds of Anglican Popery are your most able champions—ye doctrinal revisers of the Liturgy ! Bend the neck and genuflect before them ; scatter palms and flowers in their path. *In hoc signo vincetis !*—Private confession,* priestly assumption, bowings, scrapings, crossings, processions, candles, altars, millinery, and so forth. It is these things which have forced on an irresistible cry for a Repeal of the Canons, an amendment of the Rubric—in fact, a general and Protestant Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

It is, of course, out of the question to attempt in one of

* A correspondence appeared in the public papers, Feb., 1862, between the Bishop of Rochester (Wigram) and the Vice-Chancellor of the University (Dr. Jeune), upon the former's withdrawing his support from certain schools at Oxford, in consequence of the duty of *private confession* being inculcated on the pupils. To what a head the outcry on this particular branch of our subject afterwards grew, it is hardly necessary to put on record. See “Life and Labours of Pastor Chiniquy, the Canadian Luther ;” 1878.

these letters even a short analysis of the seven sections under which Mr. Gell has arranged his matter. Out of the abundance of the heart he evidently speaks, ungagged by that terrible "assent and consent" which, for lack of better argument, the enemy know full well how to cast in the teeth of all who have present preferment to lose, or future advancement in their profession to forego.* Mr. Gell, fortunately for himself, is neither a Canon, nor Chaplain to a Bishop,† but is able to write under

"the glorious privilege
Of being independent,"

"as *ex-rural* dean, and *ex-minister* of St. John's, Derby."‡

But there is a material point in which to view Mr. Gell's work that properly belongs to our department, and cannot therefore be so lightly passed over, which is this :—

How far is the impending motion of Lord Ebury before the House of Lords, for the issue of a ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY into the LITURGY, compromised or not by what is here set forth as the *sine quâ non* with Messrs. Gell and Fisher, followed by the 460 clerical petitioners of whom we have heard so much?

We shall answer this question by reference to the recorded statements of both parties, as given under their

* For example, see the *Clerical Journal* of January 30, 1862, on the Association for Promoting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

† See Letter LXXIII., p. 19; of Canon Wodchouse's resignation.

‡ It is curious to note the difference in style between those who have resigned their preferments on "conscientious grounds," and those who still retain them—"getting over their scruples as well as they can," according to the heartless idea of the Bishop of London (Tait), who, we are justified in concluding, has thus got comfortably over his own. The style of the latter may be compared to the notes of a woodlark in a cage, as contrasted with those of the same bird in its native air.

respective hands and seals in the *Guardian* of the present month.*

Lord Ebury writes to the Editor as follows :—

“SIR,—As I perceive that you continue to designate the petition of the 460 clergymen presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Horsfall, and printed there, and subsequently, at the request of Mr. Gell, presented to the House of Lords by myself, as the ‘Ebury Memorial,’ I write to say that, although you have no just grounds for giving it such a designation, I am willing to take an indulgent view of the exigencies of editorial partisanship. As, however, it appears to have induced some worthy clergymen to enlarge upon the misrepresentation, and to assert, not only without a vestige of authority, but *absolutely contrary to my own avowal*, that I was going to found my motion entirely upon the allegations of this petition, it is time that I should declare, once for all, that I intend to base my motion neither on that petition, nor any other petition, nor upon the *dictum of any party or person whatever*.

I am conscious of the heavy responsibility I have undertaken. I presume no one intends to become answerable for me in this matter, so neither have I sought, nor do I seek, to shroud myself under the responsibility of any other. I think therefore I have a claim, in candour, to be judged, in regard to this question, solely by my own declarations.

If all be well, I shall, after Easter, again submit to Parliament, I trust in a becoming spirit, *a motion for a ROYAL COMMISSION*, upon no narrow or exclusive grounds, but upon considerations, both religious and political, of the deepest possible importance to our Church and country.

Moor Park, March 3, 1860.”

EBURY.”

The above cannot but be regarded as a distinct disclaimer upon the noble lord’s part of any *necessary* connexion between his motion and the work now under our review; while the same paper, by an odd coincidence, contains the corroborative evidence of Mr. Gell himself to the like effect.

After remonstrating with the editor of that somewhat

* See letters of Lord Ebury and Rev. Philip Gell, in the *Guardian* of March 7, 1860. It will be borne in mind that the *original* form of Lord Ebury’s motion was simply that of a demand for “a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Liturgy.”

one-sided publication for his paltry criticism upon a few of the signatures to the so-called "Derby petition" (as if, forsooth, there should be no blots discoverable by a microscopic eye among the boasted 10,000 names attached to the Westminster manifesto),* Mr. Gell proceeds as follows:—

"There is another point in your mode of speaking of us which I hope you will excuse me saying it is of considerable importance to have rightly understood. You give us the title of 'Lord Ebury's supporters,' or 'Lord Ebury's memorialists.' Now, the *petition was set on foot without the slightest connexion with Lord Ebury's motion*; and, though he was kind enough to present it in the House of Lords, *he honestly declared that it was a petition he could not himself patronise*; and we have always had to support our own cause, standing upon our own ground. Of a plan which stops so short of ours as Lord Ebury's does, we cannot of course be called the adherents or supporters, as subscribers to the petition referred to. *When Lord Ebury has obtained all he asks his success is not ours*; and we shall still have our own more important improvements to plead for. Had he undertaken to pursue them, and to stand or fall with our cause, there could be no mistake in our being taken for his supporters, ready to stand or fall with him; nor would this explanation have been necessary to ensure a right understanding of the objects and principles asserted in our petition. *When Lord Ebury has done*, as far as he has already declared himself, *we have not*, as a glance at the petition will show.

March, 3, 1860."

P. GELL."

We hold these two documents, taken together, to be an unanswerable reply to those timid legislators, whether episcopal or lay, in the House of Lords, who may be disposed to meet Lord Ebury's motion with a direct negative, on the ground of its complicity with the contents of "Mr. Fisher's book," "Mr. Gell's pamphlet," or "The Petition of the 460 clergymen."

For good or for evil, we have here the best possible authority for asserting that they have no *necessary* connexion whatever with one another. Nay, more, Mr. Gell expressly

* See our subsequent analysis of this much-overrated "demonstration" of clerical opinion. Letter LXXXII., pp. 71-4.

says, "When Lord Ebury has done, *he has not.*" Let those, therefore, who oppose Mr. Gell and Mr. Fisher, reserve their opposition to such time as it is called for, and not wantonly provoke a fatal union (now disclaimed on both sides) between Lord Ebury's forces and those of the extreme Revisionists,* by that most childish of all possible principles of resistance, "Let us not say A, lest we should have to say B."

I am, yours, &c.,

March 28, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXXI.

"THE LITURGY AND THE DISSENTERS" (BY THE REV. ISAAC TAYLOR, CURATE OF TROTTERSCLIFFE).

"Bold is the task when Curates, grown too wise,
Instruct the Prelates where their error lies;
For though we deem the short-lived fury past,
Be sure the mighty will revenge at last."

POPE (Travesty).

SIR,—Our only knowledge of the writer of the above tract† is obtained from *Crockford's Clerical Directory* for 1860, where he is thus described:—

"TAYLOR, Isaac, *Trotterscliffe, Maidstone*. Trin. Coll. Camb.; 19th Wrangl.; B.A., 1853; M.A., 1857; Deacon, 1857; Pr. 1858; both by Archbp. of Cant. Curate of Trotterscliffe."

Now, supposing this description to be correct, we must confess it strikes us forcibly, as a great anomaly in our

* If this union afterwards took place, let the blame justly rest with those who opposed the noble lord in his original demand, which demand was subsequently, though somewhat clumsily, yielded, in the appointment of the Rubrical Commission of 1867-70.

† London: Hatchard and Co., Piccadilly, 1860. Second Edition.

profession, that talents which at the Bar, in a counting-house, or in an office of civil engineers, would have secured for their possessor an independence, with sure prospect of advancement, should, after seven years from his taking a good degree at Cambridge, be still rewarded with only the miserable curacy of a poor village in Kent.* There is *clearly something wrong here*, whatever there may be in the Canons, Rubric, and Liturgy of the Church; and the more so, in the particular case before us, if we are rightly informed that the Amphitryon in question is son of the veritable Amphitryon of Ongar, so well known to fame in the ranks of the Dissenters. The accession to the Church of the scion of such a house ought surely, before his thirtieth year, to have been marked by some other token than a curate's salary, amounting perchance to £25 a quarter.

But Mr. Isaac Taylor has unfortunately "written a book;" and, more unfortunately still, the object of that book is to prove—and he has done it too, with the precision of a Cambridge mathematician—that the comprehension of certain classes of Nonconformists within the pale of the Establishment (by means of some modification in our Book of Common Prayer) would be the most useful thing that could be done for the Church—yes, for the CHURCH—"at this present time."

We are aware that this is a statement so unpalatable to ears polite, that we should not have been the least surprised to find Mr. Isaac Taylor still curate of Trotterscliffe had he made it when he took his Wrangler's degree seven years ago. But seeing "the book" was written in 1860, whereas Mr. T. graduated in 1853, we cannot understand this anticipatory

* Mr. Taylor is now in receipt of gross £1,530 per annum! thanks to a *lay patron*, Earl Brownlow—to his credit be it spoken (see *Crockford's Clerical Directory* for 1878); but we have not heard of "the Curate of Trotterscliffe" writing any more books on the Revision of the Liturgy!

"Thus Whigs on places settle, and grow dumb."

condemnation, and can only explain it by supposing that though he may not have earlier *printed* his thoughts, he may have been rash enough to

“*Speak* what wisdom would conceal,
And truths invidious to the great reveal.”

These “truths,” as they appear in the forty pages of Mr. Taylor’s pamphlet, amount simply to this, that whereas the population of England and Wales may be reckoned at about eighteen millions, the Established Church only retains any effectual hold upon one-third of that number; that some five millions systematically absent themselves from every place of public worship; and that about five or six millions have forsaken the Church, and joined the ranks of the Protestant Dissenters.

Mr. Taylor bases these unpleasant calculations on the Census of 1851, and Mr. Mann’s tables, the accuracy of which we are in no condition to disprove, however much we may question it.* We should have been better satisfied had Mr.

* The following remarks on Census Sunday were addressed by the Rev. C. Girdlestone, of Kingswinford, to the Editor of the *Clerical Journal*, March, 1854:—

“In reference to Census Sunday, and to any conclusions drawn from the information then collected, I beg to observe:—

1. That the numbers attending divine service were in most cases not *accurately counted*, but *loosely guessed*, so that the returns ill deserve the name of statistics.

2. That if the numbers had been counted ever so accurately, they would have been no valid criterion from which to estimate the proportionate numbers of the *members* of each communion, for two obvious reasons; one, because attendance at divine service on the Sunday is not held to be of the same importance in all communions alike, or practised in all to the like extent; the other, because, owing to difference of organisation, it was much more practicable in some than in others to secure a full attendance on the day in question.

3. That if the Registrar-General aimed at obtaining the true statistics of religious denominations, he had but to require each head of a family to note this point for each inmate, just as was done in a matter far from being so easy to ascertain—the age of each. We should then have had not

Taylor's statistics been postponed till the publication of the Census of 1861, when a different and better mode of estimating the relative strength of Dissenters and Church people is proposed, with greater probability of giving the exact proportions of each.

For instance, in returning the inmates of every household, the master or mistress of the house will be required to enter, in a column provided for the purpose, the distinct creed of each member of the family, enrolling the servants according to their own report, and children under ten years of age according to the school they attend, or the Church into which they have been baptized. This process will be simple enough, and can hardly fail to approach nearer to the relative proportions of each class than the imperfect and fallacious method adopted in 1851.*

Building, however, upon the only foundation lying within his reach, Mr. Taylor has erected a superstructure, every subsequent stage of which is sound ; and the inference he draws is, that in order to stem the advancing tide of Dissent, "a Revision of the Prayer-book should be promoted by all sincere

a series of "guesses at truth," liable to suspicion of exaggeration, but a statement of facts made on the best possible authority ; not conjectures as to the number of *worshippers* who happened to attend on one particular day, but a return of the *actual numbers* professing themselves *members* of each community at the time being.

The bearing of these remarks on the comparative numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters will be obvious to all who are familiar with the habits of each : and, however discreditable it may be to our communion that so many who professedly belong to it do but rarely attend its services, yet it is highly probable that on such a return of facts as is above suggested, the proportionate amount of Churchmen in the land would prove more than double that which it is now made to appear.—C. G."

* This plan of arriving at an estimate of the religious opinions of the country was withdrawn from the Bill, as submitted to Parliament, in consequence of the *vehement opposition it met with from the Dissenting portion of the community*, a convincing proof (if any were wanted) that they shrink from the light of *facts* being let in upon their oft-repeated asseverations as to their comparative numerical strength.

friends of the Established Church, even by those who are perfectly content with the Prayer-book as it is ;”—concluding that “while the said Revision is expedient for the material interests of the Church, it is at the same time due as an act of plain justice to the Dissenters.”

“If,” says he, “the Church would retain her revenues and her position, the lost ground must be recovered. And in what better way can this be effected than by paving the way for a comprehension of all moderate Dissenters, and so turning rivals into allies? A few Liturgical concessions on points which Churchmen acknowledge to be comparatively indifferent—a few unnecessary stumbling-blocks removed from the threshold of the Church, and thousands of pious and orthodox Dissenters would *no longer have any ostensible grounds for their continued nonconformity*. Unless, however, some such comprehension is effected, we must expect to see an increasing relative decadence of the Church, and an ultimate preponderance of the Dissenters.” (Page 7.)

Surely if the case is here fairly stated—if a few Liturgical concessions on points which *Churchmen acknowledge to be indifferent*, and the removal of a few *unnecessary stumbling-blocks*, would have the effect of bringing in thousands of pious and orthodox Dissenters to our pale, or at least of depriving them of any *ostensible grounds* for their continued nonconformity, the experiment is worth making. But we are told this is all nonsense; it will do nothing of the kind; make what changes and concessions you will, not a single Dissenter will join you.* Be it so—and, until put to the test, it is of course open to the opponents of Revision to assume that it *would be so*—still the argument holds good, for as much as it is worth, until the experiment has been

* See a tract by the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, entitled “The Proposed Revision of the Book of Common Prayer,” p. 19.

made. And so long as nothing vital to the interests of religion is sacrificed in making the experiment, it is puerile to argue upon an hypothesis, the truth or falsity of which can be so easily ascertained.

Mr. Taylor's history of the processes through which the Prayer-book has passed before arriving at its present state of "perfection," will be read with interest, being conspicuous not more for its brevity than for the skill with which the author has seized upon the salient points of each epoch as it arose, and shown how, in the last Review (more particularly), the spirit of the High Church party was uncharitably exercised to depress to the utmost, and even designedly to annoy, their opponents.*

"After a long tugg at the Convocation House, a good doctor came out with great joy, that they had carried it for Bel and the Dragon."† This speaks volumes; and should be a warning to us how far we trust our Liturgical affairs too implicitly even at this day to a body, one section of which has declared through the mouth of the LAUD of our times that "they will not have the PRAYER-BOOK TOUCHED."

We are compelled, from the nature of the case, to pass over much of our author's tract. But, *apropos of not touching* the Prayer-book, we cannot dismiss this clever pamphlet without giving Mr. Taylor's peroration in his own words, as reading from so young a man a severe but justly earned rebuke to his elders in the ministry:—

"By refusing the least concession, *we shall promote that undefined distrust of the clergy* of which of late there have

* Nowhere has this been better exhibited than in the Rev. D. Mountfield's tract entitled "Two Hundred Years Ago." Second Edition. Kent and Co. 1862. It is to be regretted that some other liberal-minded layman has not taken this exemplary clergyman by the hand, and said to him at length, as to the curate of Trotterscliffe, "Friend, go up higher."

† "Baxter's Life and Times," by Calamy. Vol. I., p. 160.

been many painful indications ; we shall further the alienation of the laity ; we shall prevent the comprehension of the moderate Dissenters. Worse than all, we lay a grievous burden on the consciences of many pious and laborious workers in Christ's vineyard, and, by retaining the bones of contention, we are led to fritter away in party quarrels and sectarian feuds the energies which should be employed in evangelising those irreligious masses whose existence is a reproach to the Church and a terror to the State.

"It is urged that the present time is not opportune for a Revision of the Prayer-book. Surely a time of comparative peace and calmness is better suited for the introduction of mild, temperate, and conciliatory changes, than is a time of ecclesiastical upturn, and bitter theologic strife. The last Revision was conducted at such a time. It was, consequently, a violent and one-sided measure, carried by one party in the Church, in a spirit of revengeful and rancorous triumph. The changes then made *have had the effect that was intended. They have rendered the Prayer-book unacceptable to a third of the English nation.* A return to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the Prayer-book of the Reformation, would indeed be a blessed measure of peace, union, and concord. May the great Disposer of all hearts incline the minds of all men (at the present crisis in the history of the Church) to charity, which is the very bond of peace and of all virtue."*

To this Christian sentiment who is there that will not respond Amen ? But, be it remembered, that so long as the "bone of contention" remains, it is idle to *talk* about "peace, union, and concord." The experience of the last 200 years has proved that the Act of Uniformity has failed to produce that which its name implies ;† and it is scarcely possible to

* "The Liturgy and the Dissenters," &c., pp. 39, 40.

† See Lord Ebury's Speech of May 27, 1862, pp. 6, 7. Hatchard.

conceive greater confusion to result from its repeal than is now produced by its retention in the Statute Book.

I remain, yours, &c.,

April 11, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXXII.

ADVANCE OF THE TEN THOUSAND.

“All in a moment, through the gloom were seen
 Ten thousand banners rise into the air,
 Awaiting what command their mighty Chief
 Had to impose. He through the armed files
 Darts his experienced eye, and soon traverse
 The whole battalion views; their order due,
 Their visages and stature as of gods.
 Their number last he sums. And now his heart
 Distends with pride, and hardening in his strength
 Glories.”

MILTON (*Paradise Lost*).

SIR,—We learn from the *Guardian*, and other High Church organs, that the clerical “Declaration” against “Lord Ebury’s Revision Scheme” has received ten thousand signatures.*

This is certainly a very formidable number, and does great credit to the zeal and industry of the leaders of the opposition; who, acting upon the principle of “*defendit numerus*,” are determined to show that, if they have nothing else, they have at least the weight of numbers on their side.

Now, if wisdom always lay with the many, or if there were no truth in the axiom *οἱ Πλείους κακοὶ* which has met with such universal acceptance, we could well forgive Lord Ebury for quailing before these 10,000 black coats, and surrendering the field without striking another blow, as, no

* The total number of signatures to the Dean of Westminster’s manifesto was 9,925. The document has consequently become popularly known as “The Declaration of the Ten Thousand,” though, like the Millenary Petition of 1603, it fell somewhat short of the number. See Letter cxi.

doubt, was anticipated would be the case by those who originated this now celebrated "demonstration."

But as it is clear, from his lordship's having renewed, within the last week,* his notice of a motion for a Royal Commission, that he has no present intention of retiring from the contest, it may be worth while to speculate in the interim upon the probable composition of this Macedonian phalanx, drawn up in martial array against the noble lord and his little band of faithful followers.

We should have shrunk from adopting this *argumentum ad hominem*, or *homines*, (which is at all times invidious,) but for the precedent set us, in February last,† by the Bishop of Oxford, when passing in review before his hearers, in "Anne's large chamber," the "paltry" cohort of 463 clergymen, whose unheard-of "audacity" seems to have provoked the ire of this combative prelate.

It is true, we have not at this moment the 10,000 names before us published side by side with the 463, in the columns of the *Guardian* or *Record*, to be seen and known of all men. But we hope we may, without offence, hazard a few conjectures respecting them; and we willingly give our opponents any advantage they may derive from the mistakes we shall make in consequence of our thus hitting in the dark.‡

* A notice was given by Lord Ebury in the House of Lords, on Monday, April 2, 1860, to this effect—"That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, praying that she may be pleased to appoint a Commission to consider whether the Book of Common Prayer and Canons of the Church be not susceptible of alterations calculated to give increased efficiency and stability to the religious institutions of the country." (To be moved on May 8th, as it accordingly was. See Letter LXXXIV., p. 81.)

† See the report of the proceedings in the Upper House of Convocation, *Guardian*, Feb. 22, 1860. No. lxxiv., p. 177. The Bishop is very partial to this line of argument, and adopts it again in his reply to Lord Ebury, May 27, 1862.

‡ The list, since published by Messrs. Bell and Daldy, confirms in a remarkable manner the conjectures hazarded in the text.

On presenting a petition against the Revision of the Prayer-book in the Upper House of Convocation last February, the Bishop of Oxford spoke as follows:—

“The petitioners call the attention of your lordships to the petition of some 463 clergymen who have addressed the House of Lords, praying for a Revision of the Liturgy. *Whenever that document is mentioned, it would be well to bear in mind that a careful scrutiny of its contents discovers several remarkable facts concerning it.* There are many names appended to that document, *the minute examination of which would shake any possible weight that might be otherwise attached to it.* I cannot help calling your lordships’ attention to the *very unweighty character* of the great portion of the names appended to that petition. Set side by side *with that paltry* petition*—for I really can use no other epithet in describing its character—is the marvellous unity of expression of feeling with which thousands of the clergy have laid aside all those difficulties which men usually feel in placing their names to any document which may, perhaps, contain some doubtful expressions—and have declared by such an *overwhelming majority†* their earnest desire that the Church may be spared all the probable suffering, and danger, and discord, which may arise from doing anything calculated to shake that marvellous human composition, in compiling which the good and gracious help of the blessed Spirit of God can be so manifestly traced—the Book of Common Prayer of the Reformed Church of England.”‡

* This is another of the Bishop of Oxford’s stock phrases. See his speech of May 27, 1862.

† The clergy in England and Ireland together amount to about 23,000. This “overwhelming majority” of 9,925 was compiled from both countries, with the addition of the names of several foreign chaplains.

‡ Yet this has been done by the disestablished Irish Church, without any of those evil results anticipated by the Bishop: amongst other things “forbidding the compulsory recital of the miscalled ‘Athanasian Creed,’

Now, without staying to apologise for the length of the above paragraph, for which we are not responsible, we will at once proceed to apply the Bishop's rule of criticism to his own declaration—we beg his lordship's pardon—the declaration, we should have said, of the Bishop's chaplain, and the rest of the 10,000.

The Bishop of Oxford glories in the “overwhelming majority” on his side, and despises the “paltry” ranks of the Revisionists.

Has the second classman in Lit. Hum.* forgotten the schoolboy stories of Marathon and Thermopylæ?—

“A king sat on the rocky brow,
Which looks o'er seaborne Salamis,
And ships by thousands lay below,
And men in nations. ALL WERE HIS.
HE COUNTED THEM at break of day;
And when the sun set, where were they?”

Has the Bishop never read of Gideon and his three hundred that lapped? Or has any Englishman lost sight of the lesson taught us by “Harry the King” upon St. Crispin's day? Methinks we have been sent to college to small purpose, if at the Bishop's bidding we are to allow

“The sense of reckoning of the opposed numbers
To pluck our hearts from us.”

What if Alexander the Great had stood thus nicely calculating the odds on the eve of the battle of Arbela? Where would have been “the finger in his eye, and sob,” “because he'd no more worlds to subdue?” We happen, however, to remember something of our classics, which have doubtless been driven from the Bishop's brain by his self-

notwithstanding the cruel and Antichristian opposition against granting any relaxation, on the part of the Ritualistic obstructives both in England and Ireland.” (Savile, on “Who shall Revise the Book of Common Prayer?” p. 44.)

* *Vide* Crockford, article, “Right Rev. Sam. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford.” (1860.)

assumed “care of all the Churches;” and, if we are not mistaken in our figures, we think the historian* tells us of some 277 cooks in Darius’ camp, 87 cup-bearers, 360 women (not old), 29 waiters, 40 perfumers, and 66 garland weavers : the office of these last being to crown the triumphant monarch and his generals after the not yet secured victory.

Now, whether the shrubberies at Cuddesdon have been put into requisition for the approaching solemnity in the first week of the ensuing May,† we are not able to affirm ; but we hope the bays, if already gathered, will not wither through any needless delay on Lord Ebury’s part in proceeding vigorously to action.

Meanwhile, our humbler task is to count the cooks, the scullions, the perfumers, the waiters, the cup-bearers, and the women, both young and old, in the opposing army.

First, then, let us inquire how many of the 10,000 were born in the last century ? Not that we mean to insinuate—that be far from us—that all clergymen above sixty years of age are necessarily to be considered as so many old women. But allowing all due dignity and authority to the acquisition of gray hairs, we think it will not be denied, even by themselves, that they find three-score years and upwards of the wear and tear of life have done much to cool in them the desire for *change of any kind* ;—how much more, then, the desire for it in a Book which they have been accustomed to from their youth, and whose contents, albeit nearly known to them by heart, they cannot now read tolerably without spectacles.—We are much mistaken if one half at least of the 10,000 be not found to come under this category, and we dispose of them accordingly.‡

Athenæus.

† Lord Ebury’s motion was then under notice for May 8, 1860.

‡ This, which was mere conjecture at the time, has been remarkably confirmed by the subsequent publication of the list. Above half the entire

Secondly, we are curious to know how many of the remaining 5,000 (*i.e.*, of those *under* sixty years of age) belong to that section of so-called Anglican divines who lately joined in an address of sympathy with the deprived Scotch heretical clergyman, the Reverend Patrick Cheyne.*

number have since died, having been principally sexagenarians or upwards at the time they signed this conservative manifesto.

* It may be well to give here an abstract of the Romish doctrine which Mr. Bryan King and more than 400 of the clergy of the English Church endorsed, by sympathising with the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, of Aberdeen, who was very properly deprived by the Scotch bishops for preaching it. It is taken from Mr. Cheyne's published sermons:—

"When I speak of the Real Presence, I mean as the Church means, that after consecration, whole Christ, God and man, is *really, truly, and substantially* present in the Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine. . . . The three terms, 'truly, really, and substantially,' are used not in explanation, but as meeting and opposing all the errors which have prevailed concerning it. Hence they are used in a negative sense against error. We say, first, that Christ is present in the Eucharist *truly*—that is, not in figure; secondly, we say he is present *really*—that is, not simply to *faith*; thirdly, we say, he is present *substantially*—that is, not *virtually* only, by some operation, virtue, grace, or power, diffused from his sacred body. Christ is present, not in figure, nor to faith, nor in virtue and grace, but *in himself, in his whole person, in that very body which he took of the blessed Virgin*, and united to his Godhead, and which suffered on the cross, and rose again. (P. 22.)

"The sacrifice in the Eucharist is substantially the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, because *the priest is the same in both, and the victim is the same in both*. On the cross he offered a bloody sacrifice through death, but he is now offering himself an ever-living victim without shedding of blood; and so, in the Eucharist, *by the ministry of the priest*, he is offering himself an unbloody sacrifice, under the form of bread and wine. But in both cases the offering is the same, *differing only in the manner of offering*.

"We pray that 'all the whole Church' may receive through this sacrifice the benefit of the Lord's Passion—each, of course, according to his needs, and his capacity of receiving . . . whence the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead. (Pp. 33, 35, 36.)

"We do not kneel to the outward visible signs in the Sacrament, we kneel to the Lord himself, *invisibly present 'under the form of bread and wine;'* though even to these outward things, after consecration, we give religious honours. (P. 46.)

"It is not necessary, in order to obtain a participation in the benefits of the sacrifice, that all who join in offering it should at the same time receive

This address is said to have been signed by not less than 400 of our clergy. Assuming, therefore,—which is not too much to do*—that each of these individuals has contributed to swell the Bishop of Oxford's "overwhelming majority," we reduce the 5,000 to about 4,600; for we cannot for a moment allow anything but a "very unweighty character" to the signatures of men who thus express their sympathy with a pronounced and deprived heretic.

Thirdly, we have heard of certain divines condoling with the Rev. Bryan King, and subscribing† to bear him harmless in his obstinate attempt to establish a Popish ceremonial in a Protestant Church, in defiance of the clearly expressed feeling of 20,000 of his parishioners, and the vast body of Englishmen throughout the land. How many of these gentlemen, we wonder, help to swell the Bishop's "overwhelming majority?"

These are the women—old and young (chiefly the latter)—the cooks, the garland-weavers, and the perfumers.

The time would fail us to reckon up the waiters, scullions, and cup-bearers; that is to say, the bishops' chaplains, the rural deans,‡ and the archdeacons,§ who have, all of them, received their nomination direct from their lordships; which

the Communion. *The only theory necessary to the completion of the sacrifice is the communion of the priest*, which is required to complete the idea of sacrifice, as an act of communion between God and man." (P. 34.)

See *Hampshire Telegraph* of March 10th, 1860.

* An examination of the list confirms this conjecture in a remarkable manner. It may suffice to mention the names of the Rev. F. G. Lee, and Orby Shipley (since then a pervert to Rome), as samples of this class.

† One of the subscribers was a certain combative archdeacon in the North, who became, in consequence, involved in a newspaper correspondence with one of his clergy.

‡ The names of at least 160 *rural deans* will be found in the list as published by Bell and Daldy, all nominees of the bishops; while, curious enough, of the *deans proper*, who are independent of Episcopal control, only *five* appear to have signed!

§ Most of the archdeacons and bishops' chaplains are there also.

last, be it always remembered, are *said to have declared unanimously* "that the PRAYER-BOOK SHALL NOT BE TOUCHED."

We spare to count the incumbents of Episcopal livings, or those who "stand and wait" till the next vacancy of the same.* 'Twere long, also, to tell the names of the curates to those whom we have already classed under heads 1, 2, and 3;—the strait-waistcoated divines, to wit, of Frome; East Brent; West Lavington; Boyne-hill; St. Paul's, Brighton; St. George's-in-the-East; St. Philip's, Clerkenwell; St. Philip's, Stepney; St. Matthias, Stoke Newington; St. John's, Hackney; St. James's, Hatcham; St. Mary's, Soho; St. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square; St. Vedast's; St. Barnabas; All Saints', Margaret Street; Enfield; St. Saviour's, Leeds; Sidmouth, Devon; Torquay; Plymouth; Exeter; and the like.

"Not less their number than the embodied cranes,
Or milk-white swans in Asia's wat'ry plains;
That o'er the windings of Cäyster's springs,
Stretch their long necks, and clap their rustling wings."

Suffice it to say, that until the public have the list fairly before them, with the opportunity of ascertaining whether "a careful scrutiny of its contents" may not "discover several remarkable facts† concerning it, and so shake any possible weight that might otherwise attach to it," the Bishop of Oxford is hardly justified in his triumphant boast of the "marvellous unity of expression of feeling with which thousands of the clergy have laid aside all those difficulties

* About 3,000 pieces of preferment are in the hands of the bishops. See Vol. I., Letter xxx., p. 201.

† The most "*remarkable*" of these "*facts*" is the great preponderance the list contains of "sheep-walkers;"—"those who," according to Sydney Smith, "never deviate from the beaten track, think as their fathers have thought since the flood, and who start from a new idea as they would from guilt." (*Sydney Smith's Memoirs*, p. 435.)—Some 100 at least of these came within the range of the author's *personal* acquaintance.

which men usually feel in placing their name to any document."

Finally, whenever this curious "document" does appear,* it will much surprise us if these Ten Thousand Anglians have not to tread in the steps of the Ten Thousand Greeks under Xenophon, and beat a hasty retreat, if they can, to the place from whence they came. Happy, thrice happy, if their leader (the Bishop or the Dean) have the fortune to meet with an honest historian, who shall transmit his memory to an immortality of fame, inscribing his monument with the imperishable record,—

"He did his utmost to put back the tide of religious advancement in the nineteenth century,—*but failed*, through the good sense and determination of a more enlightened British public." All honour to his memory—*quia magnis excidit ausis!*

Yours faithfully,

April 12, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXXIII.

REV. FRANK MASSINGBERD ON REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

"Amphora cepit

Institui;—currente rotâ, cur urceus exit?"—HOR., *Ars Poet.*

"Promised a play—but dwindled to a farce."—DRYDEN.

SIR,—To relieve the tedium of perpetually reviewing tracts in favour of a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer,

* After the above had been published in *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, of April 14th, the document in question was sent me by an unknown hand, entitled "Declaration of the Clergy against Alteration of the Book of Common Prayer." London: Bell and Daldy, 1860.—I have since taken great pains to analyse its contents, and I challenge contradiction in *any* of the above statements. Above half the subscribers are now dead. (1878.)

we will to-day slightly vary the entertainment, by presenting our readers with the rare exhibition of a writer on the other side—the Rev. Francis Charles Massingberd,* “Rector of Ormsby South, with Ketsby Rectory, Calceby Vicarage, and Driby Rectory, Diocese of Lincoln; Prebendary of Thorn-gate in Lincoln Cathedral, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Lincoln.”† This is indeed a goodly array of clerical titles, and must add weight to the opinions of the possessor upon any matters affecting the temporalities, if not the spiritualities, of the Church.

Some few weeks ago the *Literary Churchman* commenced an article upon Revision with the following remarks:—

“The pamphlets which are continually issuing from the press show how thoroughly the clergy are rising to the defence of their Prayer-book, the defenders being at least three to one of the assailants. In the pamphlets before us this ratio *happens* to be reversed (!), but we are speaking of the whole number of them.”‡

To this piece of “splendid mendacity,” a writer in the *National Standard* replied as follows:—

“What are the facts? Since last summer no less than sixteen pamphlets have been published in favour of Revision. According to the statement of the *Literary Churchman*, there should have been therefore ‘*at least*’ forty-eight *against* alteration of the Prayer-book. I have, however, by diligent search in the advertising columns of the High Church newspapers been only able to discover, in that period, the titles of *two*, and both of these are mere reprints of articles

* Subsequently, by favour of the Bishop, Chancellor of Lincoln; where he died Dec. 12, 1872, æt. 71. Peace be with him!

† See Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1860, p. 412.

‡ In October, 1862, the number of recent pamphlets in favour of Revision, according to the list published by the Association, amounted to one hundred. We are not aware of the titles of as many as *ten* on the other side.

in newspapers or reviews. The other forty-six appear to have sprung, Minerva-like, from the fertile brain of the Editor of the *Literary Churchman*—the ‘wish,’ I suppose, as is not uncommon with the writers on that side, being ‘father to the thought.’ Surely mis-statements of this kind only damage the cause they are intended to support.—I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

CLERICUS.”

Since that time at least a dozen more tracts have issued from the press *in favour* of Revision, while (to the best of our knowledge and belief) the only one on the other side is a small *brochure* by the Rev. Thomas Lathbury;* proving, however, little, except that the same author who can laboriously compile a history *of the past* is not necessarily skilled in adapting his learning to the circumstances of the age in which he lives.

It is true, the Rev. F. C. Massingberd blew a blast loud and shrill from the lowlands of Lincolnshire about two months ago, announcing *the approaching birth* of a treatise from his pen on the same side as Mr. Lathbury;† and as this second champion in the cause of stagnation is also known as a Church historian, great was the expectation raised, and large the orders upon the county-town bookseller, in anticipation of the forthcoming work. Alas! for the disappointment both to the bibliopolist and his customers, when the rolling wheel of Time, in place of the promised vase, produces but a pitcher from the hands of this venerable potter, in the shape of two letters to the *Lincolnshire Chronicle*, bearing date *Torquay*, March 28th, and April 5th, 1860.

Whether the Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts), whose country

* “The proposed Revision of the Book of Common Prayer considered.” By the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, M.A. Oxford: Parker, 1860.

† Which said pamphlet, however, shared the fate of the “Murdered Innocents,” or rather never came to the birth at all. See Letter LXX., p. 4. Also see remarks of Mr. Massingberd in Convocation, on the Dean of Norwich’s motion, March 14, 1861. (*Guardian*.)

residence of Bishopstowe lies within a mile of Torquay, had any hand in the concoction or *revision* of these letters we know not; but they certainly emit a stronger savour of the oil of that district than of the fenny region where the reverend writer's numerous Church preferments are dispersed.

To take a sample from this South Devon olive-yard:—

“As far as can be collected from what they say, it does not appear that the advocates of a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer have paid any attention to the mode in which their object is to be gained, or have given any thought to the difficulties—(I believe the insuperable difficulties)—which they would find to be in their way when the attempt was made. A Royal Commission and an Act of Parliament, according to them, would settle the question; and as for the feelings of 10,000 [or 12,000] of the clergy, who have just now signed a remonstrance against it, these need not be considered.

“But the fact is, that a Royal Commission and an Act of Parliament *would not* settle the question;* but on the contrary, if ever such a calamity should befall this nation as that Parliament should attempt to enforce an alteration of the Book of Common Prayer on the authority of a Royal Commission alone, it would unsettle all that is most dear to Englishmen, and, if persisted in, would produce a schism far more disastrous than any we have yet experienced.”

Now, as for the consideration due to the 10,000 (herein swelled like Falstaff's men in buckram to 12,000), we beg to refer Mr. Massingberd to our last letter,† where those gentlemen have had all honour paid to their memory.

But, as to the more serious part of the above complaint, we hereby state most distinctly that we have no wish to

* Of this reverend gentleman's respect for an Act of Parliament, see Vol. I., Letter XLVIII., p. 309.

† Letter LXXII., p. 67, “The Advance of the Ten Thousand.”

ignore an intermediate step between the report of a Royal Commission and its confirmation by Act of Parliament—provided always that the Church be so represented in Convocation as to secure public confidence in its deliberations. Whereas, constituted as Convocation now is, he must be insane indeed who would hamper any proposal for a Revision of the Liturgy with the primary condition that it must commend itself to the approval of a body of legislators, who have declared “unanimously” in their Upper House that the Prayer-book shall not be touched.*

The noble mover for a Royal Commission in the House of Lords feels and sees this,† and regrets deeply, as do all sincere well-wishers to the Church, that our spiritual rulers should have occupied that obstructive position they now so unhappily fill. But his lordship does not therefore feel justified in adopting Mr. Massingberd’s *laissez faire* principle, which would allow the evil to go on accumulating, and thereby cause the problem to become day by day more difficult of solution.

Let our author first set about *reforming the two Houses of Convocation*; let him amalgamate therewith an equally reformed Convocation of York, and a fair representation of the Church in Ireland‡ (and possibly in the colonies), and then let him, with some show of justice, demand of Lord Ebury to submit his measure to their joint approval—but not before. But while he is accomplishing this Herculean task—judging by the rapidity of the movements of Convocation for the last ten years—we fear the tide of innovation will have swallowed up him and his little schemes altogether, better adapted as

* And yet the *English Churchman* of Feb. 13, 1862, observes, “The omission, from Lord Ebury’s two Bills, of any reference to Convocation is fatal to them in our opinion, even if we approved of them otherwise.”

† See two Letters from Lord Ebury to the *Daily News*, April 2 and 5, 1860, on the Services in Passion Week.

‡ This was written before the disestablishment of the Sister Church.

they are to the Caroline or Elizabethan era than to an age which is on the eve of witnessing even the Popedom itself fall a victim to the fangs of all-devouring time.*

The very words "Prolocutor," and "Gravamina,"—Latin prayers, and scull caps,—stamp the august assembly at Westminster as but a vestige of the past.† And though the Litany may still by sufferance be rehearsed occasionally at St. Paul's Cathedral in an unknown tongue, and Latin texts be hung ostentatiously in the Church of St. Barnabas Pimlico, the spirit of the nation at large is happily still essentially English and Protestant, and will have none of these things.

Our space will not allow us to dwell further upon Mr. Massingberd's two letters, than barely to refer, which we do with pleasure, to a passage at the close of the second, where he asks, "whether it is to be given up as hopeless that any step should be taken towards the reconciliation of Dissenters?" Certainly the steps proposed by himself are not calculated to accomplish that most desirable object in our time; and the age in which we live is not one to submit to schemes whose consummation is to be looked for in the next century.

Mr. Massingberd "believes that *something* might be done;" but, with the characteristic tardiness of an anti-reformer, he sees nothing but difficulties in the way of accomplishing it.‡ For ourselves we would rather first try the effect of the Commission moved for by Lord Ebury, which, after all, *can but fail* in bringing about the object we all have so much

* Nothing but the bayonets of the Emperor of the French at that time maintained the Cathedra Petri *in situ*.

† The late Dean of Chichester (Hook) being asked why he did not join his brethren in Convocation, replied, "He was busy about his book, and had no time for trifling."

‡ The Rev. R. McClure Woods, of Whittington, near Oswestry, in a letter to the Bishops on the Act of Uniformity, well observes, "So long as the reconciliation of Dissenters was practicable, the Church at large never sincerely attempted it; and now Revision of the Liturgy is opposed on the ground that conciliatory measures would be *too late*."

at heart. *When* it has failed, there will still be room for Mr. Massingberd to step forward and occupy the place thus fairly voided.

Failing, however, *both schemes*, but not before, it will surely be time enough to sit down in despair, as the writer of these two querulous letters to the *Lincolnshire Chronicle* would have us do, bearing patiently the ills we have, in preference to fleeing upon others that we know not of.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

April 20, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXXIV.

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON REVISION OF THE
PRAYER-BOOK, MAY 8, 1860.

“*Exspectata dies aderat.*”—VIRGIL.

SIR,—Anticipating some such a result as that which befell Lord Ebury's motion on the 8th inst., I have abstained from troubling you for the last two or three weeks, knowing how much your space is occupied at this season. As, however, I have reason to know that many of the clergy have been looking with intense anxiety to the issue of the late debate, I think it will not be uninteresting to them if you will allow me, through your columns, to give some account of a scene which has now taken its place among the annals of the Church, and has given to the cause of Liturgical Reform a *locus standi* it never before possessed.

Let me premise, for the benefit of your distant readers, that a sort of rehearsal of the performance (the principal actor being absent) took place on the morning of the 8th at the Freemasons' Hall. The leading advocates of Revision had been summoned to a conference by invitation, the

admission being by ticket, and reporters excluded. About 400 persons, chiefly clergy, occupied the body of the hall; the chair was taken by Lord Shaftesbury, supported by several of the laity, and some clergy of note. The speakers, fifteen in number, addressed the meeting from the platform, and were well received; especially those who were most outspoken in their expression of opinion that Revision was absolutely required, and that "the present time" was as fit as any other for the purpose. If any timid orator chanced to give utterance to an opposite sentiment, it was coldly responded to, or met by cries of "No, no," from the body of the hall.

One clergyman in particular, who was more earnest than the rest in advocating *present* Revision, was encouraged by the unanimous voice of the meeting to continue his remarks beyond the time appointed in the programme as the limit for each address.* In consequence, however, of the number of persons desirous to speak to the question, the Chairman interposed, and a layman took up the argument, following in the same line. The discussion was prolonged for three hours, and was only then brought to a close to make way for several other topics standing on the list for the consideration of the conference, one being the painful subject of the Riots at St. George's-in-the-East.

I mention these otherwise trifling circumstances, simply for the purpose of refuting those writers who, making their "wish father to the thought," have industriously propagated a statement that the public are profoundly indifferent to Revision. Whereas the fact is, that so far from being indifferent to it, they are most anxious for information; and only shrink from taking part in the controversy from a

* This speaker was "the Author of the INGOLDSBY LETTERS;" who was not a little encouraged to pursue the course in which he had embarked by the hearty reception he met with on that occasion.

consciousness of its extreme delicacy, and a vague though erroneous idea that it is a clerical rather than a lay question. Of this great mistake the laity are being gradually disabused; and the advocates for *doing nothing* will speedily find that this their last stronghold of resistance has slipped from beneath their feet;—well if it be not replaced by the usual reactionary tendency to do *too much*.*

We must now transfer our readers to the Great Council of the nation, assembled at Westminster, where a large number of clergy and others were in attendance a full hour before the commencement of the debate, anxious to secure a place in the strangers' gallery of the House of Lords. Amongst these the new Dean of Ripon (Goode), and the Bishop of London's chaplain (Gell),† were conspicuous. The doors open, there was a rush to the front, and, under the cry of "Show your orders," many persons, I suspect, got through without an order at all.

Unfortunately, Lord Ebury's motion was not the first on the list, but was kept in abeyance for nearly an hour by an extremely uninviting discussion upon some matter affecting the Duchy of Cornwall, about which nobody knew or cared anything, the Pawnbrokers' Act Amendment Bill, and Bankrupt Law for Scotland, about all which, I imagine, the public knew or cared still less. Possibly the gentlemen representing the High Church press mistook this hour of "dull and dreary debate" for the great business of the day; and hence the very venial error of the *Guardian* and *English Churchman* in applying to the discussion of Lord Ebury's motion what certainly was no truthful description of either his lordship's speech or of those which followed it. If it were otherwise, the House of Lords must be

* Witness Lord Ebury's Motion of 1862, compared with that of 1860.

† Now Bishop of Madras, and generally supposed to be favourable to Revision (1878).

endowed, beyond any assembly with which I am acquainted, with the most excellent gift of patience; for during the whole four hours of the debate which followed, and during the entire speech of Lord Ebury, there was the most profound silence and deep attention observable in all parts of the house. Such are not the usual accompaniments of a "dull and dreary debate" in Parliament.

The benches were well filled, especially on the side of the Opposition. The Bishops' corner was crowded; there being not less than twenty spiritual peers in attendance, ranged in a solid phalanx of five by four, as if to defy any attempt to break their ranks. The absence, however, of two or three eminent members of the corps gave rise to the impression that the unity of the body was not so exactly preserved outside the House as it was within. The veteran Lord Lyndhurst occupied a prominent place on the cross benches, and exhibited marked attention throughout the debate. Some disappointment was felt that the venerable and learned lord did not speak, being well known to be not unfavourably disposed to at least one portion of the subject.*

About half-past five Lord Ebury entered the House, and took his place at the table, having many documents to refer to, and being better heard from that spot than any other. As the person of the noble lord is probably unknown to most of our clerical readers, and as the part he has taken in this matter (*utcumque ferent ea facta minores*) will unquestionably transmit his name not without honour to the latest records of the Church, I may be excused for depicting the hero of the day as he appeared on this memorable occasion.

* From a personal interview the Author had with the noble lord a few days previously, he is able to state that Lord Lyndhurst was vehemently opposed to the damnable clauses of the Athanasian Creed, and the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. On other matters he prudently declined to express any opinion.

Imagine, then, a rather tall, delicate, well-formed type of a perfect English gentleman, about sixty years of age, with a handsome and pleasing expression of countenance, slightly marked with "the furrows of long thought," an eye full of intelligence and mildness, and a phrenological development in which benevolence, veneration, conscientiousness, and firmness, compose the principal features.*

Imagine such a one addressing himself not only to the Bishops' House of Parliament,—confronted by almost the entire hierarchy of the United Kingdom,—but in fact to the whole of Christendom, upon a theological question of great delicacy, involving the highest interests of mankind; himself not gifted by nature with first-rate powers of oratory—not a divine by profession—not a minister of state, executing a necessary, though possibly a distasteful function—but a private individual, with no selfish purpose to serve, and the certainty of much obloquy attending him in case of either failure or success. Imagine, I say, such an one, under such circumstances, standing up alone, unfriended, unsupported, to harangue a cold or hostile audience—including, notably, the well-known features of the Bishop of Oxford, before whom even Prime Ministers had been known to quail—for an hour and a half, without one cheer to encourage, one smile to lighten his path;—and I leave my readers to give due credit to Lord Ebury's position on the night of May 8, 1860.†

I will reserve the description of the debate for my next; only remarking in passing, that the question of entertaining

* The best portrait of his lordship is that published in the gallery of the *Illustrated News of the World*, accompanied with a short biographical notice.

† Never was there a truer illustration of the proverb, *Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte*. All the noble lord's subsequent appearances on this question bear no comparison to the delicacy and difficulty of the first.

the idea of a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer has now in a manner reached its climax—the culminating point of its history. Never till now has it occupied its rightful place before the public mind; and from this moment it will either advance towards ultimate success, or fall back to rise again no more in our time.

That the former will be the result, in spite of the discouraging reception of the motion on the night of the 8th inst., I have a strong presentiment.* Lord Ebury now appeals, through the press, from the decision of the Bishops in the House of Lords, to the verdict of a British public; and he will not appeal in vain. The only point left for the latter to determine is *the extent* to which the Revision shall be carried.† For, as for supposing that the multifarious

* There can be no doubt that up to the autumn of 1862 the question made decided progress. It received, however, a severe check subsequently *sub rege* Gladstone, who unscrupulously bestowed the whole of his Church Patronage (which was exceptionally great) on the Anti-Revision party.

† The form of Lord Ebury's resolution of May, 1860, was as follows:—
“That it is the opinion of this House, that whereas the particular forms of Divine Worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein as to those that are in place and authority should from time to time seem necessary or expedient:

“And whereas the Book of Canons is fit to be reviewed and made more suitable to the state of the Church:

“And whereas it is desirable, as far as may be, to remove all unnecessary barriers to a union of the people in the matter of Public Worship:

“That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to appoint a Commission to prepare such alterations and amendments in the Canons and Book of Common Prayer as to them may appear desirable, and to consider of such other matters as in their judgment may most conduce to the ends above-mentioned.”

It is not his Lordship's fault if the principle of the Sibylline books is applicable, and will become more and more so, to his future motions on the subject.

contents of the Prayer-book will be suffered much longer to remain in the exact form and condition in which we now have them, it would be as reasonable to anticipate a return to the use of the Roman Breviary, or to a re-adoption in our churches of the Westminster Directory of 1644.

I remain, yours, &c.,

May 21, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXXV.

LORD EBURY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, MAY 8, 1860.

“Oh, mark ye here a brave and loyal knight,
 In virtue arm'd, for fame's high temple bound:
 A per'lous toil; for fiends of fell despight,
 And every loathsome form in hell that's found,
 Start on his path, and hiss his head around.
 But vain 'gainst his emprise their threats and guile:
 Albeit with sword him listeth not to wound
 Th' infernal rout; but aye with constant smile
 He mars their graceless spell, and moves right on the while.”

SIR,—Resuming from where we left off in our last, I proceed to give a further description of the scene in the House of Lords on the night of May 8th. I shall confine myself to those outward accidents of the debate which do not appear in the public reports, but which, in a case like the present, are not without their interest.

The House of Lords, I need hardly observe, is a very peculiar assembly. Exactly the reverse of the one of which it has been rudely said, in the language of old Latimer, “that there were never so many gentlemen, and so little gentleness,”—the House of Lords may be described as all gentleness and all gentlemen—with one remarkable exception, of which more hereafter.

Of these gentlemen and this gentleness the noble lord, whom we left standing on the floor of the House, is the very

personification. Yet, strange to say, outside the walls of Parliament, no individual of our times (unless, perhaps, the late Sir Robert Peel) has been subjected to more incessant insults, and bad language, than has been the noble subject of our present remarks.

Amusing, therefore, and not uninstructional, even to bishops, as a lesson in true Christian morals,* was it to notice the "constant smile," and unperturbed address, with which his lordship proceeded to enter upon the task before him—a task from which the stoutest might have shrunk, and in which, as it will appear in the sequel, no other peer was found willing openly to stand by him, though it is well known that not a few members of the house were far from being unfavourable to the motion before it. More amusing still was it, and not less instructive as an encouragement to our out-lying friends, to watch the uneasy attitude, and "fidgety" contortions of a certain occupant of the Right Reverend Bench, whose "graceless spells" were being thus quietly put aside by the noble speaker, "moving right on the while," as he ruthlessly demolished, one by one, the sandy bulwarks of the wily prelate, establishing on their overthrow his own ideal of a National Church.

For the first few seconds there was observable in the accent and manner of the noble lord a degree of self-diffidence, contrasting remarkably with the well-known characteristics of his chief opponent.† He seemed, indeed, at the outset of his speech, to shrink almost into himself, as if appalled at the responsibility and solemn nature of the work he had undertaken. As a spectator, deeply interested

* Even his enemies cannot deny to Lord Ebury the praise of most Christian forbearance in his manner of carrying on the reform of which he has been for now twenty years the acknowledged leader. (1878.)

† Deficiency of self-esteem will hardly be claimed, by even his most staunch admirers, as one of the attributes of Bishop Wilberforce.

in the issue of the conflict, one felt an inward wish at that moment for the encouraging presence of some knight of Frondsberg, to tap him on the shoulder, and whisper in his ear, "My lord, my lord, you are entering upon a path, and taking up a position, such as I and many other men of war have never braved. Nevertheless, if thou have *right* and *truth* on thy side, and *be sure of thy cause*, go on in God's name, and be supported. He will not forsake thee."*

And so it was; and so it will be. Our modern Church Reformer gathered strength and courage as he advanced in face of all the theological lore presumed to be represented by the opposing lawn, and turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, but still facing the reporters' gallery, he seemed bent on fulfilling his mission of putting on record, through the medium of the press, regardless of the chilly silence around him, a series of facts and arguments to be appreciated by millions abroad and at home, carrying, as they do, conviction to every heart unsteered by interest, uninfluenced by prejudice or childish fear.

That speech, nearly as delivered, has now taken its place among the permanent literature of the Church.† It would be long to enter upon it here; and we have other matter before us. Suffice it for the present to observe, that be his lordship's arguments strong or weak, new or old, original or borrowed, there they remain, notwithstanding the efforts of the five speakers who followed—Archbishop, Bishops, and Lay Peers—uncontradicted and unrefuted.

* Life of Luther.

† Lord Ebury shortly afterwards committed to the press the whole of his three speeches on the Revision question. It is much to be regretted that his lordship has not seen his way to republish them in a larger and collective form, including his subsequent vast experience, and, perhaps, a portion of his correspondence on the subject.

Of the speech *as spoken*, though in matter and logic unanswerable, we cannot honestly say that it was either very impressive or very effective. The subject itself is, as the Bishop of Oxford observed, "a dry one," and does not allow of the exercise of those tropes of rhetoric and sallies of wit which give point and interest to ordinary speeches. And though the Bishop was pleased to say (we know not on what foundation) that "the noble lord had not treated the question with that gravity which its solemn character demanded," it was, in fact, owing to its being treated thus gravely, that the debate was rather dull and heavy throughout.* Lord Ebury is no actor, no platform orator, as the Bishop of Oxford is—

"But, as we all know well, a plain blunt man,
That loves the truth."

The cause he has espoused stands, like himself, upon its merits; not upon the tinsel accessories of clap-trap oratory and histrionic appliances. The noble lord

"Has neither wit, nor words,
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,
To stir men's blood: he only speaks right on,
And tells us that which we ourselves do know;—
Shows us the Book—poor, poor dumb Book—
And bids it speak for him."

Nor is there anything in this to dishearten the Reformers, or shake their confidence in the noble lord as their leader in this movement. It has ever been one of the wonderful ways of Providence to choose the weak things of this world to confound the wise. And if Lord Ebury be the weak vessel, which the *Standard*, *Guardian*, *Saturday Review*, *Morning Post*, and some other journals personally

* The *Clerical Journal* gave credit to the author of "The Ingoldsby Letters" for "having contrived to throw a little wit into a subject *confessedly somewhat ghastly*."—*Clerical Journal*, Jan. 30, 1862.

hostile to his lordship, would make him out to be, so much the greater must be the inherent strength of the cause which has thus progressed in the face of such acknowledged obstacles and perplexities, while upheld and almost singly sustained by so feeble an advocate.

Yes; and time, as it advances, will still show an increasing weight of authority and outward support on his side. Nor will all the bluster of practised and inherited volubility,* nor all the lying abuse of a malignant and semi-popish press, avail to shake the hold which the cause he has espoused has at length taken on the public mind. And be it ever remembered, to the credit of Lord Ebury,† that, under Providence, the present advanced position of the Liturgical Revision question is due almost entirely to the fact of his lordship's repeated exertions to bring it, through Parliament, under the cognisance of the great body of the nation and the world at large.

In conclusion, we are persuaded, that the obstructions and the calumnies, which have hitherto beset and entangled his path, will gradually give way, and ultimately vanish, before one who, having thus risen superior to the adventitious gifts of nature, has manfully grappled with the difficulties of his position, and is prepared to persevere in his course steadfastly unto the end. Nor will the love of fair play, inherent in the breast of most Englishmen, leave him much longer to struggle apparently alone.‡ The chivalry of his conduct will secure him friends in quarters that he knows not of; and as he has

* To Bishop Wilberforce may truly be applied what was spoken by Lord Beaconsfield, not without reason, of another well-known public character, that he was "a sophisticated rhetorician inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." See Vol. I., Letter xi., p. 69.

† See before, Letter LXXII., p. 14, "The Question before Parliament."

‡ The Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer-book, of which Lord Ebury is president, reckoned on its list of members several peers, some members of the House of Commons, and (strange to say) even two or three dignitaries of the Church!

not sought alliance by base means, so will assistance be volunteered to him by hundreds whose minds are as liberal and generous as his own.

Having finished his speech at about seven o'clock, the noble lord resumed his seat for the rest of the evening (until he rose about nine o'clock to reply), in the front rank of the Opposition benches, directly facing the serried phalanx of "mitred fathers," from whence the "iron sleet of arrowy shower" was about to be discharged upon his bare and unfriended head.

And first rose to reply, with a dignity and modesty of demeanour, and a calmness and mildness of voice, highly be-seeming his exalted station in the Church, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner), put forward, as it would appear, in the name of the majority (for we cannot believe he spoke in the name of the whole) of the Right Reverend Bench behind him.

I shall not attempt, at the close of a letter, to enter upon his Grace's speech; which, though very imperfectly heard in the strangers' gallery, appears well reported in the *Times* of the following morning.* A word, however, in parting with his Grace and his Right Reverend brethren.

Let them not lay the flattering unction to their souls that they have heard the last, either in that house or elsewhere, of Liturgical Revision. The interval that has elapsed since the delivery of the noble lord's speech has given us the opportunity of ascertaining the feelings, not only of Liturgical Reformers themselves, but of the public at large, as represented by the different journals of the day. And, unless we very much misread the signs of the times, we warn their lordships to prepare for a louder and yet a louder cry from the former, supported by an increasing and more emphatic

* Being sent there by his Chaplain before it was delivered.

demonstration on the part of the latter, while the note of opposition will become fainter and fainter.

It is possible that a little lack of generalship may have been shown on the late occasion. It is possible that, from want of sufficient organisation in the advancing army, their first attack may have been momentarily foiled by the concentrated resistance and superior discipline of the opposing forces.

But there is behind the noble lord a spirit and a determination, which will spring elastic from this temporary discomfiture. There is a still small voice within the breast of his followers, which whispers "ever onwards" in their ear, and will not allow them, while life remains, to desert a cause they have voluntarily adopted in the teeth of all worldly interests and advantages.*

Under the stimulus of this faithful and ever-wakeful monitor, we see them at this moment rising briskly from the ground, and brushing away the not inglorious dust—we hear their hearty cheer as they rouse their comrades to a fresh onslaught, passing from mouth to mouth the soul-stirring war-cry of the indomitable Argyll—

"If it were na weel bobbit, weel bobbit, weel bobbit,
If it were na weel bobbit—we'll bob it again."

I remain, yours, &c.,

May 25, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXXVI.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY (SUMNER) IN REPLY
TO LORD EBURY, MAY 8, 1860.

"These still with soft persuasive arts he sway'd;
When Nestor spoke, they listen'd and obey'd."—POPE.

SIR,—Much, but not everything, is to be conceded to the authority of age and position. Quintilian observes, of the

* The Author is not aware of a single instance of the promotion in the

relation between child and parent, that "*Non omnia præstanda parentibus;—alioquin nihil est perniciosius acceptis beneficiis, si in omnem nos obligant servitutem.*" Thus, methinks, is it with respect to the Primate of all England, and the rest of the Bishops.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, from the nature of the case, is (like the Pope) very rarely even a middle-aged man, never a young one; oftener, as in the case of the present, the last, and most of his Grace's predecessors, considerably advanced in life. If, therefore, the weight of threescore and ten, or fourscore years, is always to rule paramount in the councils of the Church, it is easy to see what a dead-lock is at once put to all hope of progress or improvement in that direction, however rapidly the rest of the world may be advancing a-head of it. Every one can appreciate the value of an Eldon, a Wellington, a Lansdowne, a Lyndhurst, as a *controlling element* in the Great Council of the nation; but few, I apprehend, would be satisfied with a Prime Minister* who had realised the patriarchal age of those "potent grave and reverend Signiors."

Now, having before spoken of the Most Reverend the Primate in language which I hope sufficiently testifies the high respect in which, both for his person and office, he is held by myself, and I believe by the universal Church,† I have the less hesitation in here protesting against a

Church of any Liturgical Reformer *as such*. The Curate of Trotterscliffe owed his advancement to other causes. Letter LXXI., p. 60.

* Lord Palmerston, indeed, as Premier, reached the astounding age of 78, "*sed cruda deo viridisque senectus*," and it is impossible to deny that the latter years of his official life were in consequence marked by a profound stagnation both in Church and State.

† Vol. I., Letter XXXI., p. 205. The Archbishop died Sept. 6, 1862, aged 82, leaving it only to be regretted that he had not given the support he might have done, and was disposed to do, to the great question of his day.

system, which, as exhibited on the 8th of this month, and on the 6th of May, 1858, seems to obtain in the high places of the Church.

I allude to the practice of putting forward the Archbishop to speak in the name of the whole order, whereby the public are taught to believe that there must be something very objectionable in a proposition which has thus twice been discountenanced by the wisdom, united to the supposed toleration, of the Most Reverend Prelate. And yet it is well known to those who are behind the scenes, and has indeed been not obscurely hinted by the Archbishop himself, when not under the control of the rest of the spiritual corps, that he is personally far from unfavourable to the spirit of the noble lord's motion.

The expression attributed to his Grace, to which we take exception, is this:—"I have thus briefly stated the principles on which, *with the concurrence of my Right Reverend brethren*, I feel it MY DUTY to resist the motion of the noble lord."

Now, what are the public to understand by these words? Was the Most Reverend Prelate overruled in council by his "Right Reverend brethren," or were they overruled by him? Behind and beside him sat, at the time he was speaking, not less than eighteen Bishops,—the Archbishopric of York being vacant at the time, the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately) absent from domestic affliction, and we missed the conspicuous outline of the Archbishop of Armagh (Beresford).* But were those eighteen *unanimous*? Surely not. Immediately behind the Most Reverend Prelate sat the Bishop of Carlisle (Villiers), whose Reply to one of the Rural Deans of his diocese we have recently had

* The following list of Prelates present and absent on the night of

occasion to notice,* as showing his lordship to be by no means unfavourable to a temperate Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, even “at this present time.”

But supposing these eighteen prelates to have been (as inferred from their silence) agreed in their opposition to Lord Ebury, on the 8th of May, they do not constitute the whole bench, or anything like it. To say nothing of the venerable Bishop of Ely (Turton), and other absent prelates, whom we might mention with honour,—

“Two still were wanting of that numerous train,
Whom long our eyelids sought, but sought in vain.”

Where were Chester and St. David’s (Graham and Thirlwall), of whom we have heard something before in these letters?† It is true St. Asaph (Vowler Short) was there, and—we are grieved to say so—(like the Bishop of Carlisle), a silent spectator of the scene, reminding one painfully of those lines of Tom Moore’s—

the 8th, is supplied in a note to Lord Ebury’s Speech, p. 28; 1860. Third Edition.

BISHOPS PRESENT.

DR. SUMNER	Canterbury.
„ TAIT	London.
„ LONGLEY	Durham.
„ SUMNER	Winchester.
„ CAMPBELL	Bangor.
„ AUCKLAND	Bath and Wells.
„ VILLIERS	Carlisle.
„ GILBERT	Chichester.
„ PHILPOTTS	Exeter.
„ HAMPDEN	Hereford.
„ LONSDALE	Lichfield.
„ JACKSON	Lincoln.
„ OLLIVANT	Llandaff.
„ PELHAM	Norwich.
„ WILBERFORCE	Oxford.
„ BICKERSTETH	Ripon.
„ HAMILTON	Salisbury.
„ SHORT	St. Asaph.
„ DALY	Cashel.

BISHOPS ABSENT.

.....	York (vacant).
DR. WHATELY	Dublin.
„ GRAHAM	Chester.
„ TURTON	Ely.
„ BARING	Gloster & Bristol.
„ LEE	Manchester.
„ DAVYS	Peterborough.
„ WIGRAM	Rochester.
„ THIRLWALL	St. David’s.
„ PEPYS	Worcester.
„ GRIFFIN	Limerick.
„ HIGGIN	Derry & Raphoe.

* See Letters LXXVI., LXXVII., pp. 34–45. “The Bishop of Carlisle (afterwards Bishop of Durham), in Reply to an Address of the Clergy of Westmoreland,” June, 1860.

† Vol. I., Letters xv., xxvii., xxix., and lxii.

"As bees on flowers alighting cease to hum,
So Whigs on places settle, and grow dumb."

There was a time when a Vowler Short would not have tacitly acquiesced in this assumed unanimity of "My Right Reverend brethren" against Liturgical Reform.*

But supposing the entire bench of Bishops—English, Welsh, and Irish—to have been present; and supposing them all to have been parties to this alleged "concurrence,"—what, after all, did it amount to?—why, simply to this (to quote the Primate's words on the occasion)—"We think that a *verbal* revision would not be worth its cost; we think that a *doctrinal* revision would throw the Church into confusion."†

Now, as this pithy sentence is, in fact, an epitome of his Grace's speech; and as it is obvious that it wholly begs the question at issue (as neither denying, nor disputing, that a *verbal or a doctrinal revision is required*), I shall confine myself to this paragraph as my text, in passing the Archbishop's speech under hasty review.

And first, for "verbal revision," as not being "worth its cost."

Has his Grace, or have the Right Rev. Prelates as a body, sufficiently considered all that is implied by those two words, a "verbal revision?"—I presume they have; for the Archbishop gives something like a definition of the phrase, where he speaks of "such a revision as should alter some of the Rubrics, correct obsolete words or phrases, retrench some of the prayers, and omit certain repetitions, chiefly with a view to shortening the service, in deference to popular objection;"—adding, with a just regard to the feelings of millions on these points, "there are, probably, few persons who do not think our Liturgy capable of receiving *such improvement*."‡

* See Vol. I., Letters LI., LII., pp. 324-34.

† *Times* Report of the Archbishop's Speech, May 8, 1860.

‡ The following is from a letter of the Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) to the

This is well as far as it goes ; but it is far from being all that comes rightly under the head of “verbal revision.” What of the Calendar of Lessons, for daily and Sunday use? * What of the Apocrypha? What of a better arrangement of the Psalms? † What of an authorised hymnal? What of the introductory sentences, and the “dearly beloved?” The Marriage Service, and Communion? What of the dresses and attitudes of the officiating clergy? The altars, candles, stoles, copes, fringes, and the like? None of these, I conceive, belong to the class of *doctrinal* alterations ; and yet are they not greatly needed?—are they not “worth the cost” of the pen, ink, and paper, postage-stamps, and printing, which a dozen well-selected Commissioners would consume in as many months, while engaged in the task of deliberating, and afterwards advising the Crown and Parliament (yes, and Convocation too, *if it will take advice*), on the best mode of arranging these matters for the greater comfort, peace, and edification of the Church?

Do not all these things tend more or less to the glory of God? And should we shrink from “*the cost*” of the

Rev. F. C. Massingberd, published in the *Lincolnshire Chronicle* of January 27, 1860 :—

“Few, I suppose, would assert that our Prayer-book, admirable as it is in itself, and strong in the associations and affections of the people, will not admit of adaptation to altered circumstances ; and there might be an almost general agreement as to the desirableness of modifying or explaining some of its Rubrics, *of revising the Table of Lessons*, and of providing some additional Occasional Services, as well as a shorter Form of Prayer for the week-days.”

* At a meeting of Convocation in February, 1862, the Dean of Norwich put a notice on the paper for “a thorough Revision of the Calendar.” This has now been done, in what is called the “New Lectionary ;” which, however, though a decided improvement on the old one, is still far from being perfect, and admits of—nay, demands—*further Revision*. (1878.)

† “A Church Missionary in India has sanctioned that great improvement in the Psalter,—*the threefold division of the Psalms*, in the revised Liturgy which he is preparing.” (Savile, p. 24.)

offering, whether it present itself in the shape of money, time, labour, or whatever else is intended by the very ambiguous expression made use of by his Grace?*

But "doctrinal revision" is a far more serious affair; for, says the Archbishop, with the concurrence of his Right Reverend brethren, "it would throw the whole Church into confusion."

Lord Ebury, on the other hand, affirms (and I fear public opinion supports his lordship in the remark) that the Church is in that happy state already;† so we might spare ourselves the trouble of arguing that matter with his Grace and his Right Reverend supporters.

But granting that a doctrinal revision should *increase* this "confusion,"—instead of allaying it, as many think it would;—even so his Grace's position is hardly tenable, if the question lies (as alleged by the Revisionists) between TRUTH and ERROR, between the inventions of man and the undoubted Word of God. In such a case, "*fiat justitia ruat cælum*" is a sound and noble maxim. And it can hardly be otherwise than desirable, if merely for the sake of peace, that a competent Commission of honest men be appointed to decide the point one way or the other; instead of leaving the clergy—yes, and the bishops too (to tell their lordships what is said of them by those that are without)—under the imputation of *knowingly* retaining in the Prayer-book certain

* Greater liberty in the use of the Calendar alone, and less stringency about some of the other *forms* in the Book of Common Prayer, would be an inestimable boon to the Church, and "the cost" of granting such liberty the merest trifle.

† See motto to Letter xxxvii., Vol. I., p. 238. Surely "the settled decision and resolute practice of millions to have nothing to do with the Prayer-book as it is," can hardly be a less evil than any that *might* ensue from the attempt to amend such a state of things. (See *Times* of May 7, 1858.)—The "Reformed Episcopal Church" has taken the law into its own hands, and boasts to have six bishops, one hundred clergy, and communicants by thousands! (See Correspondence with "Bishop Gregg," 1878.)

expressions not resting upon sufficient warrant of Scripture, and which, therefore, "ought not to be required of any one as a matter of faith." And yet we, the existing clergy, and those who will follow us, for generations yet unborn, according to his Grace's view of the case, are (or will be) called upon to give an "unfeigned assent and consent" to each and all of these (to say the least of it, *disputed*) points.*

What these points are,—what are the few terms or phrases in the Prayer-book, thus continually brought under discussion—it is needless for me to particularise. They have been abundantly set forth by others, and have been already noticed in these Letters. But nowhere, perhaps, have they been so concisely exhibited as in a late tract by the Rev. D. Mountfield, of Oxon near Shrewsbury,† which I am glad to take this opportunity of noticing with approval.

Under this head, all that Lord Ebury at present asks for, is a Commission to inquire whether these matters are *rightly*

* The *Clerical Journal* of Sept. 12, 1862, in a notice of the Bishop of Worcester's Primary Charge, observes, "Of course the Bishop of Worcester (Philpott) is opposed to the Bill for relieving persons in holy orders from the necessity of declaring their assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer. He well puts the real state of the case when he says, 'that the effect of the proposed law would have been to sanction by the authority of Parliament a distinction between the outward public use of the Prayer-book by the beneficed clergy, and their private opinions and belief respecting it;' and that 'it would have gone to weaken the authority of the Prayer-book as a test and standard of doctrine, and to destroy the confidence of the people that the teaching of their appointed ministers would be in hearty and conscientious agreement with the Liturgy they use.'" One would have expected a Cambridge senior wrangler to recognise the wide distinction between that which may be *distinctly proved* from Scripture, and that upon which the best men have differed from the days of Cranmer to our own, and will differ to the end of time as long as things remain *in statu quo*.

† Letters on the Revision of the Canons and Liturgy of the Church of England, by Rev. D. Mountfield, now Rector of Newport, Salop. (Partridge, 1860.) See also "Assent and Consent," by an Irish Clergyman. (Seeley, 1860.)—The Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer-book has put forth an exhaustive paper containing the views of that body upon these controverted points.

set forth in the Book or no; and to report accordingly to the Parliament and the country. It is impossible but that such report should clear away some of "the mists" which (to use the Bishop of Oxford's curious metaphor) "tarnish" and deface the volume, and impair its efficiency as the authorised manual of devotion for the universal British Church.

For the Archbishop, in conclusion,—we are convinced that if, instead of further resisting this reasonable and repeated demand (which, we honestly tell his Grace and his Right Reverend brethren, will never be thus silenced), he had given it his willing support, he would have done more to promote peace and quiet in the Church than it will ever be in his power to effect by any other process. A Churchman of his conciliatory temper at the head of a Commission of Inquiry, such as that moved for by Lord Ebury, would have been of inestimable value as a directing and presiding spirit, and his name would have gone down to posterity as much honoured for the exercise of moral courage, as it is now for the exhibition of every other Christian grace.*

I remain, yours obediently,

May 31, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXXVII.

LORD LYTTELTON ON THE REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

"Nil agit exemplum, litem quod lite resolvit."—HOR. Sat. ii. 3, 103.

"By such expedients truth can ne'er be tried,
They but perplex the question, not decide."—FRANCIS.

SIR,—The Archbishop having left the question of Revision more unsettled than he found it, the next peer who

* His Grace's day is past and gone. It remains to be seen whether any of his successors will profit by the rare opportunity afforded them of signalling their Primacy by a work worthy of the most enlightened of their predecessors.

rose to address their lordships was Lord Lyttelton,* who had occupied a conspicuous place in the centre of the house during the speeches of Lord Ebury and the Most Reverend Prelate; to both of which he had given marked attention, as if determined to make himself thoroughly master of the subject. We hold this for a good sign. For though the noble lord did not exactly support Lord Ebury, yet neither did he oppose him—and it was pretty clear which way his own inclination lay.

There is an honesty of purpose, an openness of countenance, and a good-natured cheerfulness of manner about Lord Lyttelton that are irresistible; and we feel persuaded that had he met the motion before the House by an amendment, in the way of compromise, instead of joining the bishops in their direct negative, he would have carried a large portion of the peers, if not a majority, with him. Nor are we sure that the noble mover himself would have been otherwise than glad of the opportunity to accept such a mode of escape from the Sisyphean labour under which he has been toiling for the last three years; and which may, for aught we see to the contrary, continue to engage him for at least three years longer.†

Lord Lyttelton, however, for some reason or other, preferred to signify his “concurrence in the recommendation of the Most Reverend Primate;” that is to say, he preferred leaving the matter for further agitation, and all the evil which is sure to attend upon a long delayed remedy of an admitted grievance. *Admitted*, we say advisedly, not only by the noble lord himself, but also by the Primate,

* This unfortunate nobleman committed suicide while in a low state of mind, by throwing himself over a staircase, in London, April 18, 1876, ætat. 59. See Vol. I., Letter LIX., p. 359.

† This prophecy was, alas! too truly fulfilled, only for *three* substituting *twenty* (!) (November, 1878.)

and not denied even by the redoubtable "Ten Thousand," whose "retreat" is already foreshadowed in Lord Ebury's unanswerable address.*

The best report of Lord Lyttelton's speech, that we have seen, is supplied in the *Guardian*. Pity that it was not accompanied by an equally faithful report of that of Lord Ebury, to enable the readers of that organ of the High Church party to profit by an opportunity (which they rarely enjoy through that channel) of fairly hearing *both sides* of the question.

As in his correspondence with Lord Ebury (which we noticed in the autumn of last year†), so in his present speech, Lord Lyttelton appears anxious that it should be understood that "he does not altogether differ" from the noble leader of the Revision movement. Lord Lyttelton, like the valiant Lord John,‡ "cannot hold the doctrine of finality, simply and abstractedly." Who, but the Bishop of Oxford, does?—He conceives, moreover, "that the Church of England ought not to be deprived of the liberty, that properly belongs to her, of adjusting from time to time her standards and formularies, being matters of human origin and composition."

And then, as to "the time"—"this present time!"—Our readers will not be surprised to hear that Lord Lyttelton "thinks that it is no great arrogance on behalf of the Churchmen of this day to believe that they are as well qualified to deal with such subjects as those of the times, whether troubled, apathetic, or corrupt, of the Reformation, the Hampton Court Conference, or the Savoy Conference." Who, but the Bishop of Oxford, ever doubted this?

* See Lord Ebury's Speech of May 8, 1860 (Hatchard, Piccadilly), p. 9.

† See Vol. I., Letter LIX., p. 358.

‡ Earl Russell, the keenest Reformer of his day; died 1878.

So far so good. Here, however, comes in that unlucky monosyllable to which the Bishop of St. David's is so partial,* and which is ever crossing the path of all wholesome legislation.

That two such eminent Cambridge men, both of them Senior Optimes, should have agreed to fix their affections on anything so insignificant, is quite surprising. Yet, so it is. Accordingly, just as we are pressing forward to congratulate Lord Lyttelton on having emancipated himself from the serfdom of fashion, in comes the miserable little BUT, Tantalus-wise, to dash the cup of joy from our lips. His lordship is a scholar, and remembers how the runaway slave was nicknamed in ridicule *Homo Trium Literarum*, from having the letters F. U. R. branded on his cheek. Were we now living in those Laudian days which some of the opponents of Revision are seeking to restore, we could almost wish to see a little pleasant tyranny exercised on the noble lord's smiling countenance, and that of the more solemn Prelate, (his ally in this matter,) if it were but to act *in terrorem* against all future legislators, and make them beware of following these two obstructives in this their wicked error of tacking B. U. T. to all their arguments.†

I shall not inflict on your readers the painful task of pursuing the diminutive imp through all its artful dodges. Depend upon it, and take it for an infallible rule, wherever a man first admits a *principle*, and then qualifies his admission with a BUT, there is something behind which is

* See Vol. I., Letters xxvi., pp. 179, 180; xxxvii., p. 241.

† The Bishop of Chester (Graham) is one of these *trium literarum homines*,—"opposing everything, and proposing nothing." He was known in his diocese by the unctuous title of "But-ter in a lordly dish," from his inveterate habit of suggesting doubts and difficulties on every occasion, though couched in the blandest and most oily phraseology.

not intended to be seen, and it is vain to look for it. It would be “*et oleum et operam perdere* ;” neither of which have we any inclination to spend on the present occasion. —“Convocation” is *one* of the “difficulties” in the way, of course. The “doctrinal” part of the subject is *another*, of course. The “interference of Parliament” *another*, of course. Just as if these three *buts* had never existed before. —Just as if the five previous Revisions of the Liturgy had never had to encounter a Convocation, a Parliament, or *doctrinal alterations* !—Why, revision without doctrine would be like poor Kate’s “mustard without beef.” The thing, Lord Lyttelton well knows, is impossible, or next to it ; and so his BUT here is a simple shelving of the subject for another two hundred years—a by no means impossible result under your Lyttelton class of legislators !

But why shrink from an inquiry into the “doctrine” of the Prayer-book ? If it is in *unison with the Bible* and the Articles, who wishes to disturb it ? *If not*, who, I should like to ask, wishes to retain it ? Does the noble lord ?—We hope, and believe not.*

Has he, then, misgivings as to the tribunal before which the truth would have to be tried ? Surely his own words contradict such an hypothesis. He is “confident,” and bids us to be so, (a bidding which, for our own parts, we never required,) “in the protection of Providence and the strength of the Church.”—Of what then is he afraid ? If these two were sufficient for our security in 1661, why not in 1861 ? Have two hundred years of the Church’s exclusiveness so

* A Conference, numerously attended, was held at No. 17, Buckingham Street, Adelphi, on June 5, 1873, for the purpose of considering whether it would not be possible to unite Evangelical Churchmen and Nonconformists, in procuring such an alteration in the Formularies of the Church of England as would bring them in thorough harmony with the Articles of Religion and the great doctrines of the Protestant Reformation ; Lord Ebury presiding.

weakened her hold upon the affections of the people that she dare no longer trust herself in the hands of the National Assembly?*

Oh, *but* there are Roman Catholics, Quakers, "Jews, Infidels, and" (not Turks, but) certainly "heretics" in the present Parliament!—Well, and what if there are? Do they make up the majority of the representatives of the people, or anything like it? Are they as one to three of the members of the Church in the House of Commons? Or if they are in a stronger proportion, how is that? How comes it that the constituency of the nation has not sent a decided and preponderating number of Churchmen to represent the national mind?† Is not this to confirm the position of the Revisionists, who maintain that the majority of the nation, or at least a large section of it, is not satisfied with the Prayer-book as it stands; and *therefore* call for a Commission of Inquiry into its shortcomings?

But, after all, Lord Lyttelton knows perfectly well that Parliament would *not* be called upon to interfere; and what is more, that the members of that body would little thank any one who would put them to a task for which they have small inclination, perhaps still smaller qualification. All that it would be called upon to do would be to ratify the Commissioners' report;—supposing always that report to be founded *on truth*, and not on the attempt of any one "party" to take advantage of another. Give us, therefore,

* If Parliament was too *liberal* to entertain this serious question in 1862-3, is it likely to be *less so* as time advances? Dr. Sherlock, in his "Test Act Vindicated" (1718), observes, that "in the year 1676 the Nonconformists of all sorts, including Papists, were in proportion to the members of the Church of England as *one to twenty*." (Life of Calamy, vol. i., p. 80.) Why are the proportions so different now?

† The long-continued and nearly-balanced struggle on the Burial question shows the strength of the Church feeling still prevailing in the Lower House of legislation, though we fear it is somewhat on the wane. (1878.)

but a well-selected and *honest* Commission,* and all the BUTS of the noble lord burst into empty air like so many soap-bubbles.

And as for Convocation—perhaps after it has fleshed itself with revising one canon,† it will not be so fastidious about attacking one rubric;—say that of the “dresses of the minister and ornaments of the Church, which were in use in the reign of King Edward the Sixth.”

It is a slow process, to be sure,—one canon in ten years; one rubric, possibly, in ten years more. Lord Lyttelton may be satisfied with such bit-by-bit legislation; we confess it does not satisfy us; and we had much rather proceed *per saltum*, as we have a faint remembrance his lordship did some twenty years ago to his M.A. degree at our common university.

I am, yours, &c.,

June 15, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER LXXXVIII.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY A REVISIONIST.

“Reverend and wise, whose comprehensive view
The past, the present, and the future knew.”—POPE.

SIR,—What I have to-day to submit to your notice is a comment upon the Archbishop of Dublin’s recent charge to his clergy, now published in the form of a pamphlet, and likely to be widely circulated.

* Not such as the Rubrical Commission of 1867-70, of which we have more than once had occasion to speak in terms otherwise than commendatory.

† The 29th Canon, after having been somewhat ostentatiously “repealed” by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1860, still remains (as much as ever it was) the law of the Church and nation, that is to say, observed by those who like, and disregarded by as many—probably by more! See Letter cviii.

The name of Whately is so well known, and so generally respected, that anything proceeding from his Grace's pen is sure to command attention; and this the more so when his remarks are directed, as on the present occasion, to a subject of such growing interest as the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

The observations of the Archbishop on this much-agitated question will be read with very different feelings by the different sections in the Church. There will be those who will find fault with his Grace, as having gone too far in the direction of Revision; there will be many who will regret that he had not gone farther; there will be more who, like ourselves, will acknowledge with thankfulness the great boon conferred upon the Church by this record in favour of Revision from one high in place and influence,* while so many similarly situated have either shrunk from giving expression to their opinions, or have thrown their weight into the opposing scale.

To ourselves it is not in the least degree surprising that, with the experience he must have of the widely diverse sentiments of the clergy, both in his own† and other dioceses, the Archbishop should not have declared himself more decidedly the advocate for an extensive measure of Liturgical Reform at this present moment. If he has erred at all, he has erred on the side of prudence and discretion, while he has sufficiently shown that his own leanings are in the direction of advance, not retrogression—action, not stagnation—in the formulæ and subordinate accessories of devotion.

* Even the *Clerical Journal* (Sept. 11, 1860) observes: "The Archbishop of Dublin is too sensible a man not to see that alterations might be made in the Prayer-book to considerable advantage."

† How strong was the feeling of the Irish Church, both lay and clerical, on the subject, has been shown to demonstration since it was emancipated from State control.

He represents the case fairly as it stands between the respective parties,—anxious, apparently, that each should have an impartial hearing, and willing to do justice to both.

“No one,” his Grace observes, “of sense and candour can deny that both by the advocates and opponents of Revision much has been advanced that has considerable weight, or at least plausibility.” Our own opinion is that the weight is all on one side, the plausibility on the other. The arguments in favour of Revision appear to us irresistible; those *per contra* to be founded on mere timidity, and a vague misapprehension of the views of the reformers—the reformers, we mean, of the nineteenth, not the sixteenth century, the opinions of which latter it is so much the fashion with the Bishop of Oxford and his adherents to uphold.*

The *omne ignotum pro magnifico* has probably a little to do with this. For our part, we had rather pin our faith on the wisdom of the Victorian than on that of the Elizabethan era, as in other things, so not least in the matter of regulating the accidents of divine worship.

Speaking, however, of the sixteenth century divines, the Archbishop observes :—“It has been urged that they neither possessed nor claimed infallibility; and that even supposing them to have had the most undoubted confidence that everything they appointed was the very best possible, under the time and circumstances, they would not themselves have thence concluded that it must be equally suitable for all future ages and for all changed circumstances. In fact, *the Reformers themselves*, were they now living, *would probably be among the very first to recommend some modification of what they never designed to fix as unalterable.*”

* See the Bishop's remarks in Convocation, Vol. I., Letter xi., p. 67.

This argument we hold to be unanswerable as against those—the Bishop of Oxford for one—who lay so much stress on maintaining the Prayer-book as it is, on the ground of its being (what in fact *it is not*) “the work of the Reformers.”

The Archbishop proceeds to show, from the analogy of the conduct of the Apostles and their immediate followers, that it was manifestly the Divine intention that each Church should be left at large, in all non-essential points, to enact, alter, and abrogate, from time to time, according to the best of their judgment.

Referring to Convocation, he designates it as “not, perhaps, the best constituted body for making alterations,” but which “might conceivably be so remodelled as better to express the voice of the Church.” The fact is, the absence of the lay element is an inherent and fatal defect in the constitution of Convocation;* and must for ever stand as a bar against its being accepted in our age as the exponent of the national mind. Add to this, its machinery for all practical purposes is far too complicated and cumbersome. To use a homely but expressive proverb, there are too many cooks. Indeed, they themselves admit as much, by devolving all their real work upon sub-committees, who, after all, are but a very indifferent substitute for a Royal Commission. Their reports, as they themselves cannot but feel, have *no manner of authority*; and, labour as they may, it must still in a great measure be all labour in vain.

On the other hand, what his Grace observes of the miscellaneous character of the Great Council of the nation, is no doubt perfectly true; but we must bear in mind that not Parliament, but the responsible advisers of the Crown,

* See Vol. I., Letter i., p. 5, on the Constitution of Convocation.

would have the nomination of a Royal Commission. And the report of this Commission, when made, would not require for its sanction the *unanimous* approval of the miscellaneous-constituted National Assembly, but simply that of the majority, which, we are persuaded, is in the main true to the best interests of religion, and would never willingly confirm with its authority anything tending to impair the efficiency or stability of the Established Church.

Knowing how your space is occupied at this season, I will for to-day close my remarks on the Archbishop's Charge, and, with your permission, will resume the subject in another letter, remaining meanwhile

Yours, &c.,

July 19, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER LXXXIX.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY ON NON-DOCTRINAL REVISION.

"If we are to consider ourselves so stereotyped as not to be at liberty to alter our forms in any respect, we shall impede the progress of the Church, lose our influence and position, and be chargeable with great dereliction of our duty."—*Chancellor Martin in Convocation, Feb. 16, 1860.*

SIR,—The Archbishop of Dublin instances a few places in the Prayer-book, out of many which, as he observes, require amendment. For example, he points out how the opening of the Confirmation Service is no longer suitable to the age at which young persons are now usually brought to that rite,* adding "that it is inconceivable that the framers of our Service could have designed that a change which has been fully established for 300 years should con-

* "The Church hath thought good to order that none hereafter shall be confirmed but such as can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments," &c.—*Opening of Confirmation Service.*

tinue for ever to be publicly announced to the congregation, and explained and vindicated. They would, doubtless, if now living, be among the first to propose that the words, if retained at all, should be retained as a *rubric*, and not as an address."

The same observation applies to some other parts of the Prayer-book; for instance, the lengthy exhortation to attend the Holy Communion, which is now in practice more commonly, and far more effectively, delivered in the form of a sermon the previous Sunday.

With regard to obsolete words and phrases, both in the Liturgy and Bible version, his Grace very justly remarks, that the same principle which led the Reformers to adopt the practice of having the public service performed in "a tongue understood of the people," would have induced them now to remove whatever is either not understood, or, which is of far more importance, misunderstood.

Of this class is the word "damnation," as used in the administration of the Lord's Supper, which, to our knowledge, has proved a most unhappy and unnecessary stumbling-block to many, simply from their not rightly apprehending its force in that particular place. It is true, as his Grace remarks, that several clergymen in this (as in many other instances) take the law into their own hands,* and read "condemnation." But "surely it is better," he adds, "that these things should be done under competent authority, and by a regular sanction of the Church, than by connivance at a departure from rules not formally abrogated." To how many cases, we ask, does this remark apply? Probably, to some hundred; and if such a devia-

* As many do with regard to not reading the Athanasian Creed, or lessons from the Apocrypha, or altering the lesson "appointed for the day." In Rom. xiii. 2, and elsewhere, the word *κρίμα* is wrongly rendered "damnation" in our version.

tion from the received law is not admissible or tolerated in civil matters, why should it be so in religious?

“Then, again,” proceeds the Archbishop, “if our Reformers, supposing them now living, had found that the combining together of several services made the whole so long as to exhaust the attention of many persons, it is likely that they would recommend a curtailment of some portions.”* His Grace suggests an abridgment of the Psalms, as one mode of correcting this now almost universally admitted defect in our present system. Our own opinion has been before expressed, but we will here repeat it, that the *alternate use* of the Litany and the Communion, where a divided morning service cannot conveniently be held in the same church (as in country parishes), is an easy and obvious method of meeting this difficulty. A certain latitude, too, in the selection of Proper Lessons on the Sunday, would frequently obviate the too great length of the service, besides being advantageous in other respects.

On the necessity for *some* change in the calendar of Lessons all parties are so nearly agreed, that it seems marvellous there should be any longer a delay in setting about this portion, at any rate, of Liturgical reform.† Meanwhile, it is notorious that the practice of “helping themselves” in this matter is becoming daily more and more common.

* A scheme to this effect was tried in 1862 by a Clergyman in the Diocese of Ripon, from whose statement it appears that out of a congregation of 200, not 20 objected to the curtailment, and these would probably have cheerfully acquiesced after a while in the “innovation,” had it been persisted in. One obvious mode of shortening the Morning Service would be that the clergyman should be at liberty, at his discretion, to omit *in rotation* any one of the three portions of which the present Composite Service consists. Everything depends upon the judgment and discretion of the officiating clergyman. The congregation, as a rule, would acquiesce in any *reasonable* modification of the existing forms.

† This point was carried. See Letter LXXXVI., p. 98, note.

throughout the kingdom. Indeed, the principal bar to a much freer use of the Bible in this way is probably due to the fact that so many of the congregation are provided with a "Church Service,"—containing (to many of them) the only portions of Scripture with which they are at all familiar,—and who are naturally, therefore, at fault if any other chapter than the one "appointed for the day" happens to be read in church. The Archbishop, among other reforms connected with this branch of the subject, suggests that it might be "advisable to make a larger selection of Lessons, and to spread them over two or three years, instead of having the same chapters read every year, while there are above one hundred chapters, many of which no one would account less edifying than the others, that are never read publicly in the Church at all on the Sunday."

About the Apocrypha his Grace is silent. But even the Bishop of Oxford, the principal opponent of Lord Ebury's motion in the House of Lords, is reported to have said, in the Convocation of 1855, that "it would be most desirable to leave out Lessons from the Books of Baruch, Tobias, and the story of Bel and the Dragon; and to put in their places Lessons from the canonical books which are not now read at all:"—a sentiment which appears to have been endorsed by the Bishops of London and Llandaff (Tait and Ollivant), who yet were silent on the subject in the House of Lords on the 8th of May last.

We have dwelt the longer on this part of his Grace's Charge, because we think the evil of the present system is much more serious than people in general consider. Or rather, people in general do not "consider" at all, or they would not be as acquiescent as they are* in such a manifest

* The apathy, or indifference, of the laity is perhaps the greatest obstacle existing to a reform of the admitted defects in the Prayer-book.

departure from the spirit and *intention* of the framers of our Liturgy; which clearly was, that the whole, and not a seventh part, of Scripture should be from time to time brought under the notice of the congregation. And when we add to this, which is a most important consideration, that sermons are for the most part founded on the Lesson, or Epistle and Gospel, of the day, it is easy to see how the field is thus practically narrowed for the exposition of Scripture from the pulpit. For all these reasons, and more which might be offered, we trust the day is not distant, notwithstanding all the alleged "difficulties" in the way, when *this evil* at least will be remedied.

Lastly, with regard to the Athanasian Creed—the Archbishop of Dublin, after Chillingworth, Tillotson, Burnet, Taylor, Secker, Watson, Parr, Tomline, Hey, Burton, and others, speaks, in our judgment, both charitably and wisely when he says:—

"If it were found that in many congregations the Athanasian Creed was either not understood or misunderstood,* and that parts of it gave a shock to the minds of some, and required long explanations which to many would prove either not intelligible or unsatisfactory, it may be fairly concluded that the framers of our services would consent to leave the use of that Creed, or of the Apostles' Creed instead of it, optional with each minister, as he might find best suited for his own flock."†

To say that this is already practically done, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, is no answer at all to those who call for an alteration of the present rubric, which appoints, and, as

* The Rev. H. R. Haweis, in a sermon entitled "Worship and Praise," observes, "Supposing the Athanasian Creed damns the greater part of the human race (as we are told it does), why, so much the worse for the Athanasian Creed." (Orthodox London, p. 16.)

† See before, Letter LXXV., p. 30. Note.

a matter of *law*, therefore, *orders* this Creed to be “sung or said” thirteen times a year. There are many over-scrupulous clergymen who feel bound to obey this, as every other, rule, simply because it is *there*, however much they may personally dislike the use of the damnatory clauses, or however offensive they may know them to be to several of their flock. We feel tempted to say more on this subject than discretion, perhaps, would warrant;* but, fortunately, a regard to your space calls upon us to desist.

In our next we will make a few observations on the “objections” which the Archbishop notices as “urged against *all change*,”—an expression with which we are, unhappily, but too familiar; but shall not, on that account, be deterred from once more entering upon the ungrateful task.

Yours, &c.,

July 26, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

* And yet we should hardly speak in stronger terms than those already used by some of the authorities above cited.

Dr. Jortin, in his “Remarks on Ecclesiastical History,” says: “There are propositions contained in the Liturgy and Articles which no man of common sense among us believes; no one believes that all the members of the Greek Church are damned, because they admit not the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; yet the Athanasian Creed, according to the usual and obvious sense of the word, teaches this.”

Archbishop Tillotson “wished we were well rid of it.”

Tomline (Bishop of Winchester), in his “Elements of Christian Theology,” says: “I cannot but conceive it to be both unnecessary and presumptuous in any man to say, that *except every one do keep the Catholic faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly*.”

Bishop Watson, in “Consideration on the Liturgy and Articles,” speaks even more strongly. Dr. Parr struck the damnatory clauses out of his Prayer-book in Hatton Church; while it is well known that the late Bishop Lonsdale (of Lichfield) would never repeat the damnatory clauses in church. Archbishop Longley also (*before he was a Bishop*) objected to them. What he did or said *as a Bishop*, I am unable to certify. Of Bishop Jeune (of Peterborough) see Vol. I., pp. 335-6.

LETTER XC.

OBJECTIONS URGED AGAINST ALL CHANGE.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN'S CHARGE.—NO. 3.

“By resisting all change you are giving strength, day by day, to Lord Ebury's motion.”—*Chancellor Martin, Feb. 16, 1860.*

SIR,—“It has been urged,” proceeds the Archbishop, “that if any, even the slightest, change in what is now established should be contemplated, many would rush forward, each with some improvement of his own, and each disposed to be more dissatisfied than ever if his favourite scheme were not adopted.”

Now we write not without extensive knowledge of the views and wishes of the various advocates for Revision; and though we do not deny that there are a few who lay the very greatest stress upon one point—namely, the baptismal regeneration question—yet we hesitate not to say that by far the majority within our own experience would be satisfied to see the whole subject fairly entered upon by an impartially-selected Commission, and then be content to abide by the issue, be it what it might.

What the majority complain of is, that the opponents of all change make use of the bugbear of the impossibility of *pleasing every one* as an argument for refusing to *please any*;—an argument about as reasonable as it would be to refuse all tickets of admission to a Coronation at Westminster Abbey, or other public exhibition, because millions must be disappointed, seeing there is not room for all.

The Archbishop of Dublin takes a wiser and more liberal view of this alleged “difficulty.” “True it is,” he observes, “that there is such an incredible diversity in men's judgments on practical points, that to give universal

and complete satisfaction is hopeless. But if this be made a decisive argument against every proposal, we should come to the conclusion, not only that no change at all should ever be introduced *in any* system, law, or institution, but that no system should ever be even established." And, to say the truth, we very much doubt whether the advocates for retention of everything as it now is (for example, a learned archdeacon in the North,* who would preserve tenaciously what he calls all "the imperfections and defects" in the Prayer-book) are not striking a more deadly blow at the root of an Established Church than any of those who are now engaged, with pruning-hook in hand, pointing out where retrenchment and correction may be seasonably and advantageously applied.

Once refuse to remove or replace a decayed stone in a building, or a worm-eaten plank in a ship, the process may be slow, but the result is sure, of a serious if not fatal injury to the whole. Such a process has been going on stealthily, but steadily, within the Church, for the last 200 years; and though, owing to the immense efforts of the past quarter of a century, and the present active age of our history, a check has been momentarily put to the deteriorating influences which are at work, the *principle* of destruction still remains, and will remain, so long as those timid counsellors alone are heard who cry out, "Touch not the ark, it is holy ground, venerable even in its weakness, sacred even in its decay."

The next objection which the Archbishop approaches is the well-worn one of the "Unfeigned Assent and Consent," about which a very able tract has been recently

* See "Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Richmond," by the late Ven. Charles Dodgson. Rivingtons: 1860; p. 20. Also the same, June, 1862. Harrison, Leeds.

published by an Irish clergyman,* and to which we must beg to refer our readers, it being utterly hopeless to attempt going over that ground again, with any prospect of novelty in the treatment.

As, however, the said awful words still unhappily remain a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence in the path of a few of the weaker brethren, it may be as well to give here the Archbishop's view of this branch of the subject.

"If," says he, "it were proposed to introduce (as has been lately done in another Church) some *new dogma* on a point which had hitherto been left open, and to insist on every one's subscribing to it, on pain of being denounced as heretical, this might be justly complained of. But where there is no matter of doctrine concerned, but only (as in the instances alluded to) some curtailments, and some change of obsolete words for such as are better understood, the objection does not apply."

Nor does it, surely, apply where greater liberty is sought in the use of existing materials; the reconciliation of conflicting rubrics; the removal of such rubrics and canons as are no longer generally observed; in fact, the reducing the whole book, in practice, to that which in theory it is supposed to represent—the established form of worship for a people whose *religion* should be, as its *dominion* is, co-extensive with the rising and setting of the sun.

The Archbishop next enters on one of the most delicate points connected with the whole question now under discus-

* "The Assent and Consent; What does it mean?" (Seeley, 1860.) See also Vol. I., Letter LXVIII., p. 405: "The Unfeigned Assent and Consent to All and Everything." By the Rev. C. Robinson, Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Blackburn. (Hatchard and Co., 1859.) See also remarks hereafter on Lord Ebury's Bill for altering the terms of Subscription.

sion, namely, how far the *omission* of certain expressions is to be construed as the *rejection* of such as articles of faith. But we must reserve this matter for our next, and remain meanwhile,

Yours, &c.,

August 2, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCI.

OMISSION OF CERTAIN PARTS CONSTRUED AS REJECTION.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN'S CHARGE.—NO. 4.

“He could raise scruples dark and nice,
And after solve them in a trice;
As if Divinity had catch'd
The itch, on purpose to be scratch'd;
Or, like a mountebank, did wound
And stab herself with doubts profound,
Only to show with how small pain
The sores of faith are cur'd again;
Although by woful proof we find
They always leave a scar behind.”—HUDIBRAS.

SIR,—The value attaching to the opinions of Dr. Whately justifies us in once more reverting to his late Charge.

The aim of the Archbishop is to set before his readers the danger, as he considers it, of amending the Prayer-book by the omission of certain parts, now, and for ages past, brought into dispute; and this danger his Grace sees, or thinks he sees, in the interpretation that would be put upon such omission.

Now, as the Archbishop appears to have an *idée fixe* upon this point, and unfortunately has succeeded in inoculating the Bishop of London with the same notion, it is material to our position that we devote some pains to analysing the fear of these two illustrious personages.

“Whenever,” observes the Archbishop, “there is, if I

may so speak, an amputation, there will be a wound and a scar."

"It has been well said," observes Bishop Tait, "in a former discussion on the subject, that we cannot have an excision without some scar. So it would be impossible to strike out parts of the Prayer-book without continually bringing to the minds of those who used it that there was something gone on which they would fondly dwell."*

Now observe, in the first place, amputation and excision are widely different terms. To amputate a limb is a very serious business; to cut out a wen or a wart a comparatively trifling matter. But we are prepared to assert that neither the one nor the other is fairly illustrative of the subject now under consideration. If, indeed, any one were so cruel as to be contemplating such an operation upon our venerated Prayer-book as was familiar in the practice of the Laudian Star Chamber (see Vol. I., p. 419), we can well understand its admirers shrinking with horror at the idea of beholding their justly-prided volume—

"Auriculis nasoque carentem."

We can easily picture to ourselves the groans and the sighs, the tearing of hair and the beating of breasts, as the worshippers compared their new temple with the old, in which their fathers did reverence to the God of Truth.

But is anything of the kind intended? We believe not. And if it were, sure we are that "at this present time" there is not the remotest chance of such destructives accomplishing their object. What might be the case hereafter if the present golden opportunity is omitted, and the work left to be done at a season of *real* danger and peril

* Bishop of London (Tait) in reply to Lord Ebury, May 8, 1860.

to the Church, we do not undertake to say. There is a tide in the affairs of the Church, as in the affairs of men; and no one has a right to expect a repetition of favourable conjunctures, if those now offering are despised.*

But to return to the amputation and excision—a painful subject, no doubt; but we are accustomed to deal with painful subjects in connexion with this Revision business, and we shall not shrink from this. No one can deny for a moment that an Apollo Belvidere *humero minor*, or a Venus de Medici reduced by an eye, would suffer materially in the estimation of a modern Damasippus. There would remain to the beholders a “continual remembrance of something gone on which they would fondly dwell.” Who, however, is about to perpetrate this awful piece of Vandalism upon those precious monuments of antiquity? We are persuaded that even Garibaldi himself, should that intrepid Reformer reach Rome or Florence in his adventurous career, will spare with a religious reverence anything so perfect and beautiful as these figures.†

But imagine, for example, the said Apollo oppressed with the lurch of *Æsop*; or the said Venus, for her many sins, judiciously afflicted with the polypus of *Agna*; and conceive some magician at hand, referring to his past performances as his credentials, and offering, by a touch of his wand, to remove these deformities, while preserving the integrity and just proportions of the statues in other respects,—who is there that would not rejoice at the offer, and close with it instantly? And the same argument holds equally true in any lesser degree. A person may be neither a Venus nor an

* Had Gaton and Old Sarum been quietly ceded to the reasonable claims of Manchester and Birmingham, the sweeping Reform Bill of 1832 would in all probability have never been passed.

† Garibaldi is a true Liberal-Conservative. He would conserve Rome by plucking out the offending member before it is too late.

Apollo, and yet may have some personal defect, which near friends would gladly see removed, consistently with the life and health of the adored object.

Love, indeed, like flattery, is slow to acknowledge the existence of defects, though apparent enough to the indifferent spectator. Nay more, occasionally it will be found that

“ ——— etiam ipsa hæc
Delectant.”

The lover will see a beauty and a propriety in that which to others appears a deformity or a blemish.

But when it comes to this—and has notoriously long come to it—that even affection itself is driven to conceal or to defend* the peccant member, and to resist its removal simply on the score of the age or delicacy of the patient, we may be sure it is high time to take counsel of the faculty, and inquire whether *something* should not be done.

But then, only think ! an amputation—an excision—what a horrid idea !

There is the basin of hot water, the ease of cold polished instruments, the napkin, and the sponge. No one likes to have a tooth extracted. The very sight of the high-backed chair will throw some people into fits. But when once the scrunch is over, and the decayed molar fairly handled between finger and thumb, instead of occupying its wonted place in the upper jaw, who so ready to smile as the young lady herself, who has been coaxed by her mamma into submitting to the disagreeable but necessary operation ? She may now go out in the barouche with impunity, and set east wind and a falling barometer at defiance.

* Witness, for example, the defence set up by several for the Athanasian Creed and the Burial Service, which last, by not having been timely amended, has now become the *cheral de bataille* of political parties ; while, as a consequence, our churchyards are threatened with an invasion by Romanists, Infidels, and men of any, every, or no creed whatever. (1878.)

Now, seriously, do the Most Reverend and Right Reverend Prelates from their hearts believe that the case would be very different with the Book of Common Prayer, if operated upon by such cautious and skilful chirurgeons as themselves? No one wishes it submitted to the handling of a charlatan. We ask only for the most gentle, considerate, and experienced practitioners that are to be had, to undertake this labour of truest love.

And, furthermore, we are persuaded that not even the above-mentioned Doctors (of divinity, not of physick) have themselves any of these foolish fears. Their sin is that they too readily adopt, or would seem to adopt, the fears of others; and by adopting them, give them a colour and a substance they would not otherwise possess. All this nonsense about wounds and sears is put into their heads by silly people who come crying to them, and cling fast, in childish terror, to their apron-strings. They have not the heart, good easy creatures, to shake them off gruffly, with a "Come, sit down like a man, and have it out at once." And so, by endorsing sentiments which are not their own, they allow their authority to be supplanted by a culpable weakness, and sacrifice to good-nature and forbearance, or more probably indolence, a power which was given them for a far higher end.

Let the experiment be made, and the "hobgoblin" of Revision, like that of Protection,* will cease to alarm any longer the innocent and confiding British public. Sure we are that infinitely more harm is done to religion by retaining the blemishes, whatever they are, in the Prayer-book, than could possibly ensue from removing them;† while at the

* See Speech of Lord John Russell in the House of Commons on the Paper Duties, August 6, 1860.

† The *Times* of May 7, 1858, observed, "What controversy that such an attempt may raise can ultimately be so disastrous to the interests of the Church as the settled determination of millions to have nothing to do with

same time, a valuable opportunity is lost of introducing many improvements into the volume, which even those who shudder most at the idea of sears, excisions, and amputations, are sincerely desirous to witness.*

Commending these few lines to the mature consideration of the heads of the Church, whether in Dublin or London, York or Canterbury,

I remain, yours, &c.,

August 10, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCII.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON IN REPLY TO LORD EBURY,
MAY 8, 1860.—NO. I.

“Verum, nec nocte paratum,
Plorabit, qui me volet incurvasse querela.”—PERSIUS.

SIR,—Some little time ago we were engaged in analysing the speeches delivered in the House of Lords in reply to Lord Ebury. Having been compelled to desist for a while, in consequence of the pressure of other matter, we will, with your permission, now resume where we left off, which was just as the Bishop of London (Tait) rose to address the House.†

As a quiet spectator of the scene from the strangers' gallery on the evening of May 8th, the impression produced on my mind by the different speakers partakes partly of observation then made, and partly of a perusal of the

the Prayer-book as it is, or, it may be added, the deep-seated dissatisfaction of millions who still continue to use it?”

* Of this number, if we may judge by their writings, are the Bishops of St. Asaph (Short), St. David's (Thirlwall), Durham (Baring), and even the Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) himself, now of London.

† Now Archbishop of Canterbury; in which position, however, he has done little or nothing, that I am aware of, in the way of promoting Liturgical Reform. (1878.)

speeches as furnished by *the press* the following morning. It is impossible to over-estimate the debt of gratitude we all of us owe to this last estate, for thus furnishing to the absent public a report of all that is spoken on these occasions. But still an eye-witness is enabled to form a more faithful judgment of the debate than the most industrious decipherer of the closely-printed columns can possibly arrive at.

The speech of the Bishop of London on the present occasion is a case exactly in point. He has evidently the ear of the House, and he deserves it. Of all the Peers who addressed themselves to the question of that night, the Bishop of London was the most distinct in his utterance, and he spoke for about half an hour. The Bishop of Oxford was more voluble, no doubt, but he was not equally well followed : nor could it be said of him, as of the other Prelate, that not a word of his fell to the ground. On the contrary, deeply interested as I was in the subject under discussion, honesty obliges me to confess that I more than once found myself at fault in attempting to keep pace with the Bishop of Oxford's rapid, but frequently inconsecutive, harangue.

It was not so with the Prelate now under our consideration ; whose tone and manner were well calculated to give all the effect which tone and manner can do to a carefully-prepared oration, the only defect in which was, that it wanted the earnestness and the unction which nothing but the *mens conscia recti*, the heart speaking from its own fulness, can give. And the persuasion was still forced upon our minds, as we listened to the steady and melodious flow of words from his lips, that the Bishop of London, for some reason or other, was all the time arguing against his own inward convictions.*

* Precisely the same impression was produced by his lordship's speech on the " Assent and Consent Bill " of May 27, 1862.

The Bishop is a scholar and a practised speaker. No member of the House has less occasion to have recourse to notes than himself. Why, then, give the air or bare suspicion of insincerity to his speech on so grave a question, by the mere occasional—for it was but occasional—resort to a something carefully concealed at the bottom of his college cap?

We had never before heard his lordship speak in public ; but we are persuaded that, in addressing the London cabmen, or ragged schools, or any other of the numerous classes whom his enlightened Christianity continually urges him to exhort, he discards the aid of corks, and throws himself confidently upon the overflowings of a tongue uttering the language of the soul. But was it so on the 8th of May?—Did the mouth then speak from the fulness of the heart?—We think not. There was every evidence, to our judgment, of a play-actor rehearsing his *rôle* ,—an orthodox divine delivering with measured accent a copied sermon—a Rugby scholar canvassing nicely, upon the annual speech-day, the policy of the Carthaginian General—

“An petat urbem
A Cannis, an post nimbos et fulmina cautus,
Circumagat madidas a tempestate cohortes.”

What are canons and rubrics to the Bishop of London, or the Bishop of London to canons and rubrics, that he should weep for them?—Has he not broken them a hundred times?—And will he not do so, with perfect *nonchalance*, a hundred times more?—He is not a giant, it is true, in outward bulk ;

* In a “Letter to the Bishops,” by the Rev. R. McClure Woods, Feb., 1862, occurs the following:—“You know that the Act of Uniformity is habitually infringed by many who are sticklers for Rubrical exactness, and it is even said that some of your lordships are not guiltless in this particular.” This deponent sayeth true.

but he is not such a pigmy as to be bound by all the fetters which his got-up speech and unnatural logic would impose upon the Anglican clergy for another century.*

To make a long story short, the Bishop of London, on the 8th of last May, for the first, and, let us trust, for the last time in his life, appeared in a false position—the right man in the wrong place; and he must have felt it. He, who has done more than any living prelate of the day to break through the trammels of formalism and caste, was there standing forth the apparent supporter of the Bishop of Oxford in his vain attempt to drive back the Church upon the legislation of the Laudian era, instead of taking his natural place as seconder to Lord Ebury, in a measure of which it is not too much to say that a bolder, or one more needed, has not been brought before Parliament and the public in our age.

We shall not at present attempt to follow the Bishop of London through his address, extending as it does to near a column's length in the report. Nor shall we, indeed, think it necessary, even in any future letter or letters, to enter *seriatim* into his arguments. They have most of them been fully discussed and answered before, and are, we fear, but too familiar to our readers. But our respect for the Bishop's character and person is such, that we shall feel bound once again to recur to his speech, in order to satisfy ourselves that we have not misjudged his lordship,—and at the same time to give our readers, who may have forgotten its purport, the opportunity of deciding for themselves at leisure how far its general tone is, or is not, in accordance with the estimate they

* The author would not have allowed the above strong language to appear in a new edition of these Letters, had he known in what milder manner to express the feeling produced on his own mind, and that of many others, by the terms attributed to the Bishop while speaking of clerical difficulties—"They must get over their scruples as well as they can." (See *Times'* report of the speech on the following morning.)

have formed of this prelate, since his elevation to the post he now holds in the Church.

I remain, yours, &c.,

August 27, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

P.S.—The following notice of the Bishop’s speech appeared in the *Daily News*, July 24, 1860, and is worth preserving, as correcting certain unintentional errors in the speech as reported:—

THE BISHOP OF LONDON ON THE REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

To the Editor of the “Daily News.”

“SIR,—The Bishop of London, in his reply to Lord Ebury, on Monday evening, made three assertions, the incorrectness of which I ask your permission to point out.

“1. The Bishop stated that the Prayer-book had been revised only at periods of great revolution. This is only true of the last of the four revisions which the Liturgy has undergone. I admit that when the first and second revisions were made, the country was in an unsettled state as to ecclesiastical affairs, but the Bishop appears to refer to the political state of the nation. When the third Revision took place, no revolution disturbed Church or State.

“2. The Bishop stated that the Liturgy was revised at the abdication of James II. The Bishop could hardly have made such a blunder; the reporters must be in fault. No revision took place at that time, though it was certainly attempted.

“3. The Bishop stated that the subscriptions and declarations required from the clergy of the Church of England amount to no more than this: the person subscribing accepts the Thirty-nine Articles, promises to act according to the formularies of the Church, and uphold the royal supremacy. I wish most sincerely that the Bishop were right, but in truth the Bishop is describing *what should be*, not *what is*, our subscription.*

* A Commission was afterwards issued “to consider and revise the various forms of subscription and declaration required to be made by the clergy of the Established Church on ordination, or on appointment, admission, or induction, to any ecclesiastical dignity, benefice, curacy, lectureship, or office, and to report their opinion how far they may be altered and simplified consistently with due security for the declared agreement of the clergy with the doctrines of the Church and their conformity to its ritual;” and on their report a material modification of the terms of subscription was adopted. This was another substantial and most important point gained by this much abused agitation. (1878.)

"The clergy are obliged to profess that they believe every word in the Thirty-nine Articles, and most of us think that we are pledged to a belief in every line contained in the Prayer-book. This is too much to ask from 20,000 thinking men. I am speaking the sentiments of many of my brethren, when I say that our consciences are troubled by the stringency of the declarations which we have made. We ask Parliament to relieve us, as it does other classes in the community, and we pray Lord Ebury to plead for us until Parliament gives us the relief we seek. We wish to be honest men, and not to be required to say that we believe things we disbelieve. We are attached to the Church of England; we think her doctrines generally to be true; we venerate the Prayer-book, use it gladly, and would, if we could, use no other; we think that a declaration to this effect would be sufficient, and save the clergy from a world of quibbling and hair-splitting.—I am, &c.,

July 24.

"OXON."*

LETTER XCIII.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON IN REPLY TO LORD EBURY,
MAY 8, 1860.—NO. II.

"He ceased, but left so pleasing on their ear
His voice, that list'ning still they seemed to hear."—POPE.

SIR,—Agreeably to our promise we proceed to comment upon a few passages in the Bishop's speech of May last.

With his lordship's exordium we have no fault to find. We should be the last to dispute his position, that "the Church of England never stood more firmly or more securely than it does at the present time." But the conclusion we draw from this hypothesis is the very reverse of that drawn by the Bishop. So far from thinking the above a valid reason for resisting Lord Ebury's most moderate proposition

* The writer of the above was the Rev. David Mountfield, M.A., at that time Rector of Oxon (now of Newport), Salop. By a curious misunderstanding the letter was attributed to the Bishop of Oxford (S. Oxon.) in a popular novel of the day, and led to some explanatory correspondence between the Bishop and the novelist, the Rev. JAMES PYCROFT.

for repairing the breaches in its walls, taking out the decayed stones, and replacing them by sound ones, "cleaning the windows,"* removing the lichens, and the rest—we think it the very strongest possible argument for setting cheerfully about the task.

Were the Church in any real danger, from within† or from without, we might, indeed, be afraid to meddle with the old building. But it is precisely because we hold, with the Bishop of London, that it stands firm at this moment in the hearts of the people, that we, for our part, whatever others may say or think, judge this to be of all others the very *dextrum tempus* for getting rid of what even its best friends admit to be defects in its constitution.

The Bishop proceeds to say, that he had been no party to any resolution passed by the Upper House of Convocation determining to resist any change whatever in the Prayer-book. This statement is so far satisfactory as at once dispelling the illusion which has possessed some people's minds, that the bishops are *unanimous* in resisting all change.‡ We have never been of that opinion ourselves, and are only surprised that so many of the Right Reverend prelates should have tacitly allowed themselves to be misrepresented, as they have been by others, in this particular.

Canvassing next Lord Ebury's speech, which we must say the Bishop treats rather unfairly, he asks, "What is the practical grievance of which the noble lord complains, and what is the practical good which he seeks to effect?"—And

* An expression used in reference to this subject by the Venerable Arch-deacon Bonney, of Lincoln. See Vol. I., Letter xxi., p. 150.

† It was probably from fear of danger from *within*, rather than from *without*, that so many shrunk then, and still unfortunately shrink, from joining the movement.

‡ See Charge by Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Higgin), at his annual visitation, September, 1860.

then, somewhat after the fashion of the mother of Sisera, he returns answer to himself, instead of allowing Lord Ebury to state his own case.

The “practical grievance” of which Lord Ebury complains, unless we widely mistake *both* of his lordship’s now published speeches,* is something far more extensive than the limited interpretation supplied by the Bishop, that “the Rubric gives rise to dissensions.”

The “practical good” which Lord Ebury seeks to effect, the Bishop either forgets, or omits, to define. But, to our judgment, “the practical good” (to take the lowest and narrowest possible ground) would be this,—that it would remove a long-standing bone of contention, which has given rise to endless quarrels, suits, differences, and disputes, that have at various times distracted, and are still distracting, the Church of Christ in these parts. It would bring the wisdom of two hundred years’ experience to bear upon the working of the Church, which is now required to observe in detail the stringent Act of 1662;—or else (which is the lesser, indeed, of two evils) is driven into a perpetual violation of the law then passed, and which to this day is nominally in force.

If to do, or even to attempt, all this, be not a “practical good,” we have yet to learn what is deserving of that name. And if the Bishop, or any one for him, should say Lord Ebury’s proposition for the appointment of a Royal Commission, which is all his lordship asked for in May last, would fail to produce the above happy effects, we must repeat ourselves, and say, “assertions are not proofs,”† and, until

* Lord Ebury’s published speeches on this subject now amount to *three*, and sufficiently tell their own tale; all they require is to be more extensively circulated, in a collected form, and larger type than they hitherto have been. See Letter LXXXV., p. 89, Note †.

† Vol. I., Letter v., p. 29.

the experiment has been fairly made, no one has a right to pronounce authoritatively upon the probable result.

But then comes the argument of the "wound and the scar,"—"excision," "amputation," "laceration," and other painful metaphors borrowed from the Dublin Anatomical School.*

The Bishop of London, we are quite sure, has no occasion to be beholden to others, not even to an Archbishop, for a figure or a trope; and, we are persuaded, the longer his lordship contemplates this particular expression, the more he will be disposed, with ourselves and others, to "jest" at the horrible phantom he has raised. Why, the *Guardian* of but last week, in a brief notice of Archbishop Whately's Charge, took alarm at the very idea of bracketing (to say nothing of omitting) the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, lest the doing so should raise the image of a "scar" in some people's eyes! Is the Bishop of London one of these alarmists? We think, and believe, not.

Next follows the question of the Burial Service,—that great stumbling-block with the Anti-Revisionists, as several of their number (including even Bishops,† Deans, and Archdeacons) unwarily joined in the memorial of the 4,000 for an alteration in that service.

The way the Bishop "gets over" this difficulty is sufficiently original; and, if it were not for the solemnity of the occasion, we should say not a little amusing. "No clergyman," according to the Bishop of London's theory,

* See before, Letter xci., p. 121. The Bishop of Oxford, following in the wake of the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of London, observes, "It has been admirably suggested, *the excision even of an excrescence leaves a scar*; how much more the removal of one feature upon the presence of which depended the combined harmony of the face." (Charge, Nov., 1860.)

† For example, the Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson), the Bishop of Natal (Colenso), and several other of the Colonial Bishops.

“could be prosecuted for omitting to read, or for *slightly altering*, the Burial Service, unless the Bishop of the diocese were a party to the prosecution.” Slightly altering;—“only a little one;” “is it not a little one?”—only, for example, forgetting, or possibly omitting, to state that the resurrection of the departed to eternal life is so “sure and certain” as the Prayer-book says it is.

Hold there—retort the Anti-Revisionists—the Prayer-book says nothing of the kind—and you only show your own ignorance in so representing it. Well, then, be calm, my dear friends, and I will alter my own language, if I cannot that of the Prayer-book;—and I will say, “as ninety-nine out of every hundred of the *bystanders* who hear the service read, *think* that the Prayer-book *says it is*,” whatever you and I, in our greater wisdom, may think.

However, the Bishop’s remedy, supposing it to be founded on law and usage (which we are rather disposed to question), would but amount to this—that the conscience of the individual clergyman, who is thoroughly acquainted with all the circumstances under which the deceased met with his end, is to be dependent on the conscience of the Bishop, who knows nothing at all about it except through the said clergyman’s representation;—a novel mode, certainly, of shifting a burden off your own shoulders on to those of another, which we fear will hardly satisfy some of the 4,000, however well adapted it may be to minds well disciplined in the art of “getting over their scruples in the best way they can.”

For ourselves, we see no manner of objection to *an alternative form* of prayer* being offered here, as is done

* The expression in the American Prayer-book is, “looking for the general resurrection at the last day, and the life of the world to come.”

“Archbishop Longley is reported to have said, in his place in Parliament, that instances, other than those named in the Rubric, might occur in

in other places in the Prayer-book,—a form which might be easily framed in such a manner as to give offence to no one; and would rarely do so, if but common discretion (which we, for our part, are willing to give the bulk of the clergy credit for) were used in its adoption.*

With regard to “shortening the services,” the Bishop is willing to admit that “there are occasions when we all feel the services to be very long.” These occasions are those in which the bishops are principally engaged. Perhaps if the Right Reverend Prelate could put himself in the place of a not very strong incumbent, or a worn-out curate with a “sole charge,” he might conceive of other occasions, besides those he instances, in which “the services are felt *by us all* to be very long.”†

Of the ever-memorable “ten thousand,” the Bishop thinks Lord Ebury “spoke rather harshly.” For our parts, we thought his lordship dealt too leniently with those gentlemen;—so differently do different minds judge of the same thing. For when we bear in mind how those 10,000 names were

which he could not conscientiously read the Burial Service, and that nothing should induce him to read it.

The Bishop of London is reported to have said that in cases such as those contemplated by the Primate, he would shelter recusant clergymen from legal penalties.

Had these excellent men, when candidates for holy orders, declared to the Bishops from whom they sought ordination, that they intended to use their own discretion in the use or omission of the Burial Service, it is tolerably certain that they would neither of them have been admitted into the ministry of the Church of England. As laymen they might have risen respectively to high offices in the State, but certainly Lambeth Palace and London House would never have been occupied by their present most distinguished tenants. I may use this freedom of expression without casting any offensive imputations on these excellent prelates.”—SIR HENRY THOMPSON, *Frant Rectory*, Aug. 24, 1863.

* We are persuaded that the absence of such an *alternative form* deprives the clergy of a powerful influence over the morals of their flock, while the present form, by its invariable use, has a hardening effect on the conscience.

† See the opinion of the Bishop of Llandaff, Vol. I., Letter XLIX., p. 314.

industriously scraped together—sea and land being compassed, as Lord Ebury well observed, for the purpose; how of that minority of the clergy several have at various times expressed sympathy with the noble lord's motion; how a careful examination of the list proves beyond all contradiction that a large proportion are of the class subject to direct episcopal control;* and how, of the remainder, another large proportion consists of the elderly clergy, who would naturally be averse to any material change in a book to which they have been accustomed for half a century; we confess our surprise is not at the "harshness" of the manner in which they were treated by the noble lord, but at the effrontery of those (whoever they be) who dare to represent that list of got-up signatures as any criterion whatever of public opinion in this matter. And we have no doubt that, even of this list of less than half the clergy, there is at least a tenth part who would at this moment gladly withdraw their names, if they could, from being thus gibbeted to all posterity as "expressing their conviction that *any attempt* at the present time to alter the Book of Common Prayer would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church."

The Bishop touches gently on the Athanasian Creed. Of this we have spoken before, and shall not repeat ourselves here—

"For what so tedious as a twice-told tale?"

—But when his lordship gravely advances it as an objection to revision in this particular, that "the question as to the use of this creed, *like all the rest*, is by no means a *new one*,"

"Risum teneatis, amici?"—

we are tempted to ask, with all possible respect for so

* It is noticeable also that the dioceses of Oxford, Exeter, and Salisbury furnish considerably above an average proportion of the signatures.

eminent a member of the Legislature, whether the same argument was allowed to hold good against entertaining Parliamentary Reform in 1831, Catholic Emancipation in 1829, or the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846?

Finally, his lordship says a good deal about Convocation, and the Book of Canons.

Of the repeal of these last we shall think it time enough to speak when we find them generally observed by bishops.*

Of the former we have already spoken more than once in the course of these Letters; and having not scrupled to signify our dissent from the Bishop of Oxford's views on the subject, we shall not hesitate to demur to the Bishop of London's opinion, that “the rival Parliament over the way is already *perfectly competent* to do what is requisite, provided only it had the assent of the Sovereign.” We have, on the contrary, very high legal authority for believing that “the rival Parliament over the way,” *with or without the assent of the Sovereign*, is competent to nothing of the kind,—and, what is more, never will or can be. In this view, we are moreover confirmed by the testimony of a bishop, who has conclusively reasoned out the case in a recent Charge to his clergy.†

We hope, therefore, that the Bishop of London will cease to rely any longer on that rotten reed; and as he has shown himself throughout this speech—whether intentionally, or not, we presume not to say—an advocate,

* See the opinion of the Bishop of St. Asaph (Vowler Short) on the subject of the Canons, Vol. I., Letter LII., p. 329.

† Charge by the Right Rev. William Fitzgerald, D.D., late Bishop of Cork. London: Parker, 1860; pp. 14—18. See also the opinions of Sir Fitzroy Kelly (afterwards Chief Baron), Sir H. M. Cairns (afterwards Lord Chancellor), Richard Jebb, and Dr. A. J. Stephens (the most eminent Ecclesiastical lawyer), on behalf of the late Archbishop of Armagh on the repeal of the 29th Canon. Feb., 1861. Rivingtons.

damning by singularly weak arguments the cause he professes to have espoused,* but which it is impossible he can from his heart approve ; so, on his next appearance, we trust to see his lordship in his true colours, and to hear him speaking *his own thoughts*, and joining to support the cause of the Revisionists through evil and through good report.

I remain, yours, &c.,

September 3, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCIV.

THE REVISED PRAYER-BOOK OF 1852, AND THE REVISION
MOVEMENT OF 1860.

“A thing devised by the enemy.”—SHAKESPEARE, *Rich. III.*, Act v., Sc. 3.

SIR,—You lately favoured us with a Review of the Book of Common Prayer as revised in 1852, and published by Pickering, London,—concluding your article with the following remarks:—

“Our readers will be able, from what we have now laid before them, to form a conclusion for themselves. There is one thing very certain, and that is, that if *this be the kind of revision* that is desired in influential quarters, we had better by far be content with our present Prayer-book, *faulty and imperfect as it may be*. The book we have laid before them will have done some good, if it serves to show at what a price the desired uniformity is to be purchased ; and what would remain after every disputed expression or offensive doctrine had been removed.”

To whom your reviewer may refer under the term “in-

* The Bishop of London concluded his speech of May 27th, 1862, by saying, “Their lordships would observe he had spoken on *both sides* of the question.”—*Times’ Report*. See Vol. I., pp. 276—280.

fluent quarters," I am, of course, ignorant. But as only one individual is known to myself as coming properly under such a designation, connected with the question of Revision, I beg most emphatically on Lord Ebury's part (being now absent on the Continent) to repudiate any such idea of a Revised Prayer-book as that lately exhibited in your columns.*

The book itself I have not seen, nor have I any reason to believe that it has been seen by the noble lord who has taken up the question of Revision in Parliament. It is hardly fair, therefore, to cast a slur on a good cause by insinuating its possible connexion with a work of distinctly Unitarian tendency.

This is no new device of the enemy. It was attempted in the case of Tillotson, Burnet, Watson, and others. But I trust Lord Ebury's well-known attachment to the Church, as well as that of the more prominent of his supporters, will sufficiently protect them, and the cause they espouse, from the impression intended to be produced by the disingenuous writer of this Review.†

I am, yours, &c.,

Sept. 29, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

* The extracts given in the Review were many of them adapted to the Unitarian form of belief. It is the fashion with the opponents of Revision (*Blackwood* and the *Quarterly*, for example) to hold up some extravagant specimen of a Revised Prayer-book, and to represent it as a fair exponent of the views of *all* Revisionists.

† Another very different form of a Revised Prayer-book for the use of the "Reformed Episcopal Church in Great Britain and Ireland" has since been published by J. F. Shaw, 48, Paternoster Row; 1878. See Letter LXXXVI., p. 99. It may be as well to note here that this last specimen of a "Revised Prayer-book," as also a "Reformed Episcopate," owes its origin entirely, I believe, to the fact that many of the clergy and hundreds of the laity will no longer submit to the thralldom of being compelled to use the Prayer-book of 1662, *pur et simple*, as we now have it, 1878.

LETTER XCV.

EARL STANHOPE ON THE REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

“By the revival of the active powers of Convocation, it is probable that the enemies of all religion will often be gratified with the unseemly sight of *conflicting divines*.”—LORD MAHON’S “History of England,” Vol. I., chap. IX. (Anno 1718).

SIR,—It is a relief to ourselves, and cannot but be so to our readers, that instead of the long list of bishops and archbishops who have hitherto engaged our attention, we have a layman expressing his sentiments on the subject of a Revision of the Prayer-book.

One would be tempted at times to think that the laity were either ignorant how large a portion of the Church they form; or that they were supremely indifferent as to the manner in which its services are conducted in their presence.* There seems no other rational way of accounting for the apathy (we had almost said the stolidity) with which for now full five years they have been all but passive spectators of a scene in which their interest is involved fully as much as that of the clergy, who have hitherto borne the brunt of the battle.

Is it, or is it not, for example, a matter of indifference to the congregation, whether the Sunday Morning Service lasts ordinarily for two hours, or one hour and a quarter? †—Is it a matter of indifference that they hear the Lord’s Prayer read

* In London, where there is a large choice of churches, this may be a matter of comparative indifference; but the case is far otherwise in the country and small provincial towns.

† The author of these Letters has practically reduced the Morning Service in his own Church to these limits, except on those Sundays when the Holy Communion is administered, to the great contentment and satisfaction of the congregation, without a single dissentient voice. (1878.)

five or six times in the same service, with several other repetitions in a less degree?—Do they, or do they not, care to be told *thirteen times a year*, that they will, “without doubt, perish everlastingly,” if they do not “keep whole and undefiled” every article of the Athanasian Creed?

We only put forward these, not to be tedious, out of a hundred points, some of them of even greater importance, which have been raised in the course of the present discussion. And we ask, if the laity are *not* stupidly indifferent to all these things,—caring, like so many Gallios, for none of them, why are they silent?—Why, for instance, when Lord Ebury brought forward his motion in the House of Lords last May, were Earl Stanhope and Lord Lyttelton the only two laymen who spoke at all to the motion—(for Earl Granville† gave no opinion one way or the other)—and that in opposition to the noble lord?—Can we believe that no other lay peer took any interest in the question? Or is it conceivable that they were all frightened, as many of the bishops are said to have been, by the noise of the Bishop of Oxford?

Why, too, is the House of Commons so long dumb on the subject? Of six hundred and fifty-four representatives of

* A divine of no mean authority on this matter writes as follows:—“Many of the clergy prefer to do violence to the meaning of words, and interpret certain parts of our services in a non-natural sense, to having them reformed; and the expressions in the Baptismal Service, the Ordinal, Burial Service, and Visitation of the Sick, to the plain grammatical meaning of which some Churchmen take such grievous exception, they prefer to interpret for themselves than to have them altered by authority.

“*But it is not so with the laity*; on the contrary, if Englishmen were polled at this moment, we believe it would be found that nine-tenths of them, possessing intelligence enough to comprehend the matter, would vote for alterations more or less important, or, to use a common expression, would desire LITURGICAL REVISION.”—*Disestablishment and Disendowment*, by Rev. Henry Burgess, LL.D. Longmans, 1875; p. 13.

† See Letter xcvi., p. 145.

the people, is there not one who is also a representative of the Church in that House?*

But, to have done with our queries—which we must, however, say, in passing, demand an answer—we will proceed, according to our wont, to make a few remarks upon the speech of the noble earl who followed the Bishop of London in replying to Lord Ebury in May last.

Earl Stanhope (better known as the late Lord Mahon) was, it will be remembered, the *primum mobile* in ridding the Prayer-book of the State Services, of which we have spoken before.† His lordship draws a marked, and not an unreasonable, distinction between the circumstances attending that operation and the one now proposed by Lord Ebury.

The State Services were, strictly speaking, no part of the Prayer-book. The Rubric, the Calendar, the Occasional Offices, and the like, are. This, we suppose, Lord Ebury does not deny. But this, though a good reason, perhaps, for taking the State Services first in order, is hardly an argument for not taking the other more important matter into consideration at all.

But this course even Earl Stanhope himself is scarcely prepared to insist on. He thinks that a conclave of bishops and archbishops (or, as the Bishop of London calls it, “the rival Parliament over the way”) is all-sufficient‡ for the purpose required; and appears to take it for granted that they will grapple with the question.

He considers that “such parts of the Rubric as direct the

* The question seems at last likely to be taken up in earnest in that House; but, alas, by one who is not a member of our Church, Mr. Edward Jenkins, M.P. for Dundee, author of “The Church and the Law.” (1878.)

† Vol. I., Letter xxxiv., p. 221, “The State Services Expunged.”

‡ His lordship seems to have forgotten the passage from his own History, which we have taken the liberty to reproduce (in a slightly modified form) as the motto to our present article. See more on the subject of Convocation in the same place.

order, distribution, and arrangement of the services, are points, to deal with which the authority of the right reverend prelates would suffice, without any appeal to the House of Lords or the other House of Parliament ;"—and his lordship expresses "*a hope* that they may be able to make some recommendations,—which (he adds), no doubt, would be received with the greatest respect."

Hope, we have heard said, and have ourselves too often experienced, will occasionally tell a flattering tale ; and we have learned, consequently, to distrust its syren voice.

But supposing, in the present case, the hope to be no longer hope, but a certainty ;—supposing, that is to say, the right reverend prelates were to concur in recommending certain alterations in the Rubric, as far as regards "the order, distribution, and arrangement of the services," are we any nearer the mark than we were before ? Will the recommendation of any number of right reverend prelates supersede the authority of an Act of Parliament ? This would be, as the Home Secretary observed the other day in reference to the issue of a special commission in the Road murder case, "highly unconstitutional, and a departure from the principles upon which this country has long been governed."*

"'Twould be recorded for a precedent ;
And many an error, by the same example,
Would rush into the State.—It cannot be."

Is the writer of England's political history from the peace of Utrecht to that of Aix-la-Chapelle prepared to maintain the doctrine of such an *imperium in imperio* as regards the State ? And if not as regards the State, upon what principle would he advocate it as regards the Church ? For ourselves,

* Sir G. Cornwall Lewis's letter to the Mayor of Bath, Sept. 3, 1860. The same may be said of the attempt to appoint bishops for heathen lands without previous nomination by the Crown. See a well-written tract on this subject, entitled "The Royal Supremacy," by Anglican (the Rev. D. Mountfield, Oxon, Salop). London : Hatchard. 1862.

we recognise no law of human authority except the law of the land. And we hold that law to be essentially dependent on the concurrent approval of the *three* estates.

“To this favour must we come at last.”

And if at last, why not at first? Why not appoint at once a commission of bishops, with *other* clergy and *laity*, to consider the question in all its bearings, and then, upon their joint report, invite Parliament to give its sanction to the suggested alterations?

What is the noble Earl afraid of? We have read his historical pages with interest, and see in them nothing but sound argument and common sense. Why cannot his lordship bring the same principles to bear upon this matter that he does upon the Reformation of the Calendar, which he designates as “the chief and most successful measure of the Session of 1751?”*

Why should England in 1860 be branded in *effect* (though not in so many *words*) by his lordship, as Russia is in his book for its conduct respecting the Calendar a hundred years ago?—Why should the *statu-quoists* of our generation be encouraged in “clinging to an exploded system,” for no better reason than because there is a *little difficulty* in establishing the new?

Let Earl Stanhope himself be one of a dozen Commissioners, with Lords Lyttelton and Ebury as colleagues,† and we will undertake to assure him that there is more likelihood of the public being satisfied with their report than with any amount of “recommendations” proceeding from bishops and archbishops, aided by all the concentrated wisdom of “the rival Parliament over the way.”

* Lord Mahon's History of England, vol. iv., chap. 31.

† These three were included in the Commission on Clerical Subscription, which did at least *something* towards removing the ills complained of.

Nothing is so narrow as class legislation. The Church has suffered from time immemorial under this dire infliction. Dissent owes its strength, and even its very existence, to it. And we are convinced that there is no other mode of extrication from the difficulties surrounding the question, than a mixed commission of clergy and laity, with authority to take *the whole subject* into their consideration; and required to report in due time the result of their labours to that tribunal on which alone the nation at large reposes in perfect confidence.*

I remain, yours, &c.,

Sept. 13, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCVI.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD (WILBERFORCE), IN REPLY TO LORD
EBURY, MAY 8, 1860.

“Proinde tona eloquio, solitum tibi.”—VIRGIL.

“Nay, an thou’lt mouth,
I’ll rant as well as thou.”—HAMLET.

SIR,—Earl Stanhope having resumed his seat, Earl Granville next addressed a few words to the House, to the effect that, as Lord Ebury’s motion did not appear to meet with

* A repeal or modification of the Act of Uniformity is advocated by many in preference to a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Book of Common Prayer. The two are, however, perfectly distinct in their objects, and should not be confounded. The repeal of the Act of Uniformity would, no doubt, give great relief to our Dissenting brethren, but nothing but a Royal Commission can deal effectually with a Revision of the Prayer-book. Supposing the Act of Uniformity repealed at this moment, every imperfection in the Prayer-book would still remain. The Bishop of Worcester (Philpott, well observes in his late Charge, p. 51, “There is no way, as far as I can see, of getting rid of the difficulty, other than by *revising and altering the rules upon which the difficulty arises.*” London: Bell and Daldy. 1862.

acceptance from the Right Reverend Bench, it would be advisable to withdraw it ; and there the debate seemed likely to terminate, as it had done under somewhat similar circumstances in 1858.

At this point, however, the Bishop of Oxford—who had made himself conspicuous throughout the evening, “flitting here and there with all the restlessness of quicksilver about that part of the House where the Bishops sit, nudging the elbows of one of his coadjutors, whispering a word in the ear of another, and in passing by plucking his brother of Lincoln by the sleeve,”* stepped briskly forward to the table of the House, and taking his stand directly fronting Lord Ebury, thus began one of his well-known harangues, which on the present occasion lasted, without a pause, for about half an hour :—

“My lords : Had I not felt convinced that the noble lord, in submitting his motion to the notice of the House, had no other object in view than *the benefit of the Church of which he is a member*, I should hardly have felt myself called upon to trouble your lordships with any remarks with respect to it.”

“*Quid dignum tanto*,” thought I to myself, when I had a little recovered my faculties from the suspense in which they had been held during the delivery of this pompous exordium—

“*Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatus ?*”

Is he going to tell us that, however true a friend to the Church the noble lord may be, the Bishop of Oxford is a truer ?—However ardent Lord Ebury’s desire to prove the sincerity of his love by *removing* her blemishes and defects, the Bishop would outdo him by his fixed determination to *retain* them ?—Will he presently appeal to the mighty works he has

* See leading article in *Bell’s Weekly Messenger* of May 12th, 1860.

done at Cuddesdon, Lavington,* Boyne-hill, and the like, as against any credentials his rival can produce in token of his affection ; exclaiming lustily in Eccles' vein :—

“I love, I too, the Church. Forty thousand Eburys
 Could not, with all their quantity of love,
 Make up my sum.—What woul't thou do for her ?
 Zounds, show me what thoult do !
 Woul't weep ? woul't fight ? woul't fast ? woul't tear thyself ?
 Woul't drink up Esil ? eat a crocodile ?—
 I'll do't.—Dost thou come here to whine,
 To outface me by talking of REVISION ?—
 Be buried quick with her, and so will I !
 And if thou prate of mountains——”

Hold there ; if we mistake not, the noble lord said not a word of “mountains,”—it was the bishop, and the bishop alone, whose towering imagination carried him so near the skies.† The noble lord, in a quiet, inoffensive, and, we thought, almost too submissive tone, had simply begged the Right Reverend Bench to lend him an attentive ear, while he set forth to the best of his poor ability what he believed to be defects in the Prayer-book, and the means whereby he thought they might be remedied. Can anything be conceived more humble than this ? What foundation did it afford upon which to erect the following grandiloquent superstructure ?—

“I cannot for a moment admit that the Prayer-book of the Church was a compromise, but I believe, though not a compromise, it was intended to be a comprehension——

(Curious *comprehension*, which expelled at one fell stroke two thousand ministers of religion from their homes, and sent

* The Bishop had lately been presiding at a harvest home at this place, where we are told he recommended the company to go out and enjoy the games in spite of the rain, which would never hurt “us Sussex folk, who are neither sugar nor salt !” Lavington, it is now almost forgotten, was the scene of some of the earliest demonstrations of that Ritualism which has since been the cause of so much disquietude in the Church. (1878.)

† See before, Letter LXXI., p. 11.

them to beg their bread throughout the land, and to propagate the seeds of dissent in a geometrical ratio by the space of now two hundred years—)

“ Here two great truths arise, separate like two mountain peaks,* but they have one deep, common basis ; they are equally founded on the truth of God, and feeble man stands between them. Then philosophy endeavours to combine them. It is a vain effort, as vain as if, by mechanical force, it would endeavour to bring together the two peaks of the mountain chain, whose roots are struck deep down in His infinite wisdom. Man is to receive both, each in its completeness ; God has revealed them to him, therefore he is certain they are true, and he must leave it to God’s wisdom to reconcile them.”

Every child has heard of the one mountain and the one mouse. Behold here a surpassing wonder—a twofold mountain and a *twofold*—not mouse, but—TRUTH ! We had always thought before, and are strongly disposed to think so still, in spite of all the mists overhanging this cloud-capped Ben Cruachan of the Bishop’s invention, that *truth* was *simple and one* ; and we shall be surprised indeed if, when a little time has blown all this vapouring away, it does not appear that *truth*, to be itself, must still, like its Author, be ONE ; as its *opposite*, like *its* author, having a twofold purpose to serve, wears therefore a double face.†

* The bishop is so enamoured of this figure that he repeats it in his Charge of the same year, p. 62 : “ These two great truths may be calmly and reverently viewed as *two vast mountain peaks* appear to the natural eye—one in very deed, however far apart they soar, in the great underlying unity of the common truth in which they are both embedded, and from which they both emanate.”—*Bishop of Oxford’s Charge*. 1860. Rivingtons.

† It was well said of a person known to the author, who was notorious for his duplicity, “ Oh, S—— ! he wears two faces under one hat.” When dead, it was said of the same—

“ The great J. W. S. lies here
While living he lied everywhere.”

But, after all said and done, what had this to do with the motion before the House?—

“*Pictoribus atque poetis*

Quidlibet audendi semper fuit æqua potestas.

Scinus; et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim:—

Sed non nunc erat his locus”——

But Bishop Wilberforce is neither a painter nor a poet, that ever I heard of. What right, therefore, has he or any man to put words into Lord Ebury’s mouth which, to the best of our recollection—and we were present at the debate—the noble lord never used; or to suggest ideas to his mind which—and we believe we know that mind at least as well as the bishop does—the noble lord never entertained? It is usual in England, whatever may be the case at Rome, to judge a man by his published sentiments, when they can be obtained, and are not disavowed by their supposed author. Let Lord Ebury, then, be heard for himself, in his speech, now gone into its third edition:—

“Well, my lords, but perhaps you will ask me *what it is that I desire this Commission to do*.—I think I have shown you a state of disorder in our ecclesiastical system, as now constituted, calling so loudly for remedies, that if a Commission were appointed, common sense would direct its members to take into consideration the numerous specific demands that have been made for improvement, rejecting what to them appears objectionable, recommending what seems the most practicable, just as did the American Convention of our sister Church; taking evidence, either written or oral, upon points of doubt or difficulty, and circulating queries when they desire further information.

“The Commission would, I presume, be composed of ecclesiastics, with the admixture of a few laymen; at all events of some civilians, to assist in the review of our canons and constitutions. It would be animated, doubtless, by

the spirit which is so well set forth in the letter of the American Episcopal Convention to the Anglican bishops (1786), namely, not to depart from any doctrine of our Church, but carefully to consider the alteration of such things as are calculated to remove objections which it would appear *to be more conducive to union and general content* to obviate than to dispute.”*

What is there in all this to justify the Bishop of Oxford in raising his cry of “The Church in danger?”—Is a revision of the Prayer-book such a new thing? Was a Royal Commission never heard of before it was asked for by Lord Ebury in May last?—Why, then, should the bishop think it necessary to conclude his oration in the following deprecatory and almost threatening tones :—

“He knew his noble friend would pardon him for speaking with plain earnestness respecting his motion. *He was quite sure he meant good to the Church of England, and that his efforts were directed to the good of souls.* But if he would only realise the ultimate consequences of the course on which he had entered, and if he saw that their lordships had determined not to give their sanction to his proposal, he thought his noble friend would do well, and would best consult the peace of that Church which he loved, by abstaining from renewing his motion in any future year.”

Believing as we do, on the contrary, that the interests of the Church will be best served by this motion being carried in some form or other,—we trust that Lord Ebury will continually renew it, until the eyes of all (save possibly the Bishop of Oxford) are opened to see that the Church is in *more real danger* from resisting than from conceding it.†

* Lord Ebury's Speech of May 8, 1860. Hatchard, Piccadilly; p. 22.

† See “Assent and Consent, by an Irish Clergyman,” p. 35. Nisbet & Co., 1860.—The form Lord Ebury's motion assumed in May, 1862, was that of a Bill for relaxing the terms of subscription. See Letter cxxvi.

The Bishop wound up his address with some flippant remarks about “the stridulous grasshopper that sits up aloft,”—which reached our ears as we sat in the gallery;*—but as these words (whatever they might refer to) did not appear in the report of his lordship’s speech as given in the papers of the following morning, we do not think them deserving of further comment in this place. At the same time there may be no harm in reminding his lordship, in passing, that his dictatorship does not as yet extend beyond the limits of his own diocese; and that the harmless little animal will still continue to chirp in its obscurity, unawed by the frowns or threats of the would-be Laud of the universal Church.†

And so, taking our leave of the Right Reverend Prelate as he resumed his seat amidst the cheers of the Conservative portion of the House,

We remain, yours, &c.,

Oct. 5, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

* The only reply we would make to so complimentary a notice, supposing ourselves to have been referred to,—as we understood it at the time (and as it was understood by those who sat with us “up aloft”), the Bishop looking up, and pointing contemptuously to the strangers’ gallery, where the author sat a silent spectator with other Revisionists—would be “Strike me, but hear me.” The words, it is true, did not appear in the published reports of the speech, being of course utterly unintelligible to all but ourselves and a few others who were behind the scenes. See Vol. I., Letter xli., p. 271.

† This haughty and overbearing Prelate little dreamt of being stung in the heel by such a miserable worm as a poor country parson; still less did he reckon on being bearded face to face by the same, armed with no other weapon than a goose’s quill!

It was on this occasion that the following clever epigram was sent to the author by the late learned (but, alas, unpromoted) Doctor Croly:

“Why did Goliath show surprise
When first young David met his eyes?”

“Because the thought of such a bore
Ne’er entered his thick skull before.”

LETTER XCVII.*

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

“Thus have I heard on Afric's burning shore,
 Another Lion give another roar;
 And the first Lion thought the last a Bore.”

BOMBASTES FURIOSO.

SIR,—As some of the readers of these Letters will have probably seen the review of them furnished in your impression of the 17th inst., it is due to the great question, in support of which the letters are written, that you permit me to expose, through the same channel, the many fallacies—to use the mildest expression—with which the review abounds.

Taking the statements of the reviewer in the order in which they stand in his article, I hope to make it appear that, under much plausibility, there is a substratum of misrepresentation pervading the whole. Supposing, therefore, the opponents of revision (of whom I take the reviewer to be one) to have no better arguments than those here adduced to allege against us, let us hope that there will be a truce for the future on both our parts; and that we shall mutually address ourselves to devising the best mode of carrying out the unavoidable revision of our venerated Prayer-book.

The greatest fallacy is at the very outset of the notice, as if the enemy were resolved to put all his strength into the front of the battle. So we are told that “the spring-tide of the Liturgical Controversy is now at its lowest ebb.”

“Thy wish, my friend, was father to that thought.”

Let any one who has watched the progress of this agi-

* This letter was in reply to a review of the second edition of the “Ingoldsby Letters,” which appeared in one of the London papers, Oct., 1860.

tation, from its revival in 1855 down to the present hour, say at what period during that interval the prospects of the Revisionists have been brighter than they are now. It is true that a dozen fresh pamphlets are not published every month, as they were about this time last year, in support of the measure; for the best of all possible reasons, that there must be an end to all things, and that not one of the scores that have been published has as yet received a satisfactory answer.

But can our adversaries name any previous epoch, in their imaginary ebb and flow of this cry for revision, wherein a bishop has been known to step forward from the serried phalanx of his brethren of the lawn, and openly to proclaim himself friendly to almost the extreme section of the movement? A bishop, too, of no ordinary attainments, of high connexions, in the prime of manhood, and full vigour of his intellects?*

"When went it by since the great flood," that an Archbishop (Whately) devoted two-thirds of his triennial charge to discussing the entire subject; himself inclining to the view of those who would grapple with *all* the "difficulties" of the case, and dispose of it at once?

Is it on the records of the Church that a third bishop, of known moderation (Philpott of Worcester), added his voice to swell and give harmony to the cry?† Surely at the mouth of three such witnesses the word may be considered as established, that the revision question, so far from being on the "ebb," is moving steadily forward towards its accomplishment, and taking deep hold on the minds of men.

* Bishop Baring, of Gloucester and Bristol, now of Durham (1878). See Letter xcviir., p. 158.

† Perhaps the nearest approximation to the present state of the revision movement is that of the times of Tillotson, Tenison, and Burnet, 1689.

The reviewer having thus, as he conceives, demolished our cause *in limine*, proceeds next to attack *ourselves*. It is now "Ingoldsby's" turn to feel the lash, and wince and writhe under the critic's pen.

"Cædimur, inque vicem præbemus terga flagello."

We have overdone it, says our reviewer, by prefixing six mottoes to our volume,* testifying to the superiority of the "ridiculum" over the "acri."—We should ourselves have written *acre*, but let that pass.—The statement itself is untrue. We have *not* prefixed six mottoes to our volume. The second motto is simply a translation of the first (by particular desire) for the benefit of the ladies, who, we have reason to know, take a lively interest in the subject.† The third has nothing to do with either *acre* or *ridiculum*, but is merely a notice to all anti-revisionists, from bishops down to reviewers, that a country parson is watching their words, spoken or written, and will *print* his comments thereon. The fifth (which the reviewer calls the *sixth*) is a parody of Virgil, telling a homely truth, not always acceptable to ears polite, that till men could be brought to see the *anti-revisionists* in their real light, as occupying a very "ridiculous" position, it was vain attempting to get a hearing at all, which happily we have at length got;—and the result is, that truth and common sense (as usual in such cases) are about, however tardily, to prevail.

Even the reviewer himself is constrained to admit (what he would not have done three years ago) that our present Prayer-book is imperfect;‡ but then, says he, by your

* The mottoes are reduced at the commencement of the present edition, being introduced elsewhere in the body of the work.

† "Prælia conjugibus loquenda," may be truly said of "Revision."

‡ The *Clerical Journal*, that staunch anti-revisionist paper, observes (Jan. 30, 1862), "We are far from asserting that the Prayer-book is perfect, and

process of revision, the book will "come out of the cauldron little better than it went in. The question is between two imperfect liturgies; the present and the revised one."

Fallacy No. 3, or, which is much the same thing, assertion without a shadow of proof.

It is easy *to say*, before the trial has been made, that the public would gain nothing by revision. It is as easy to assert the contrary. Meanwhile the *onus probandi* surely rests with those who refuse to submit their old father to the boiling operation. One thing is quite certain, that the book, whose imperfections our opponents are so enamoured of, cannot grow young again of itself; there must be some friendly Medea to lend a helping hand towards relieving it of the infirmities of age.

Then we are told we shall not gain a single Dissenter by our alleged desire for a charitable comprehension:—"There always were Dissenters, and there always will be."*

we readily admit that *when it can be revised by friendly and authorised hands*, a benefit will be conferred upon the Church."

The sometime editor of this journal writes as follows in 1875:

"In all essential particulars, if a worshipper in a parish church who died in the 17th century could now find himself in the same place, he might use the same Prayer-book, and attend to the same forms which he then employed. Indeed, for a *century previous*, since the reign of Elizabeth, the Prayer-book has possessed the same character of immutability.

"But this phenomenon will appear the more remarkable when two things are considered:

"First, that the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer did not contemplate this finality, as appears from their preface.

"Secondly, that almost throughout the whole of these 300 years desires for revision and alteration have been more or less expressed.

"Yet the *quæta non movere* principle has up to this time had power enough to defeat the efforts of those who are given to change; and the same resolute defiance of popular feeling has succeeded in preventing a reform of Convocation, and in keeping down every really important measure for the improvement of Church organisation, both in Cathedral and Parochial life."—*Disestablishment and Disendowment*, pp. 13-14.

* See Lord Ebury's speech of May 8, 1860; p. 20. "It is said all attempts at conciliation will do nothing; you will drive some of your

Now I have lived for some fifteen years in the country*—

“Obscuro positus loco;”

enjoying no small portion of that *otium sine dignitate* which the great Liturgical reformer, Sir Matthew Hale, was thankful to fall back upon at the close of his glorious career. There was one drawback, however, to this otherwise earthly paradise, when I first came into these parts—

“Nihil est ab omni parte beatum”—

the highways, and even turnpike roads, were execrable. It was in vain I remonstrated, in vain I threatened; “they always had been so in the memory of the oldest inhabitant;” mine was not the first carriage that had stuck fast in the mud, nor would it be the last. Being, however, put presently into the commission (not for the revision of the Liturgy, but of the peace), I set my shoulder to the wheel, and by dint of a £5 fine or so upon some recalcitrant surveyor, and incurring a little temporary odium amongst my bucolic neighbours, I succeeded in removing the only drawback to my felicity; and we hear no more of lamed horses and shattered vehicles, while we have the satisfaction of paying half the amount of rates for good roads that we before paid for bad.

“Quid rides?—mutato nomine de te (Mr. Reviewer),
Fabula narratur.”

Let the undeniable obstructions in our Church system be taken out of the way—the blocks of stone, the six-inch ruts,

attached Churchmen away, and gain nothing from the ranks of Dissent. These are assertions wholly unsupported by practical proof.” Edmund Calamy, on the other hand, speaking of Tillotson’s idea of comprehension, 1689, observes, “I was one of those that was very well disposed towards falling in with the Establishment, could his scheme have taken place.”—Life of CALAMY, Vol. I., p. 207. London, Bentley, 1829.

* Now upwards of thirty, and all I have seen and heard in that long experience tends only to confirm and establish the opinion expressed in the text.

the dirt, and the clay—and we are mistaken if the ecclesiastical coach will not roll along smoother than it has done for the last two hundred years; ever since, in short, the Act of Uniformity *has proved it impossible for religion to be uniform*; and the determination to exact conformity by force has multiplied Dissent till it almost equals the members of the Establishment. We are deceived if, in this event, church-rates will not be cheerfully paid, where they are now resisted or grudgingly disbursed;*—in fact, if almost all that we now complain of in the matter of public worship will not become a thing of the past, and charity and goodwill take the place of acrimony and mutual recrimination.†

Lastly, asks the reviewer, “Who is to do it? Ingoldsby says a Royal Commission.”—And to that view we still adhere, and shall adhere—till the reviewer (which we hold to be impossible) has pointed out a better course.‡

As for Convocation, which the reviewer swears by—when it has succeeded in *revising a single Canon*, it may prove itself in a condition to attack a single Rubric, and so by degrees proceed to the consideration of the whole Prayer-book. We have said, however, and say it again, the thing is *impossible* in practice;—however plausible in theory. To wait for the decision of Convocation is to wait till “the consummation of all things;” which *we* are in no disposition to do, whatever may be the amount of patience possessed by our unknown reviewer.§

* There can be little doubt that church-rates were lost to the Establishment from the obstinate resistance to all measures of Church reform and comprehension, while such things were possible.

† Until the trial has been made, no one is justified in saying this view of the case is Utopian;—“Exitus acta probat.”

‡ But everything depends upon the *constitution* of such Commission. It is absurd to expect grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles.

§ “The Reformation had never been brought about, had it been left to a

To whom, we beg, in conclusion, to offer our best thanks for his courteous notice of our efforts in this difficult matter; and especially for the opportunity he has thus afforded us of brushing away another batch of the cobwebs which intercept the light of TRUTH from illuminating our Sacred Cause.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Oct. 22, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCVIII.

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL (BARING) ON THE
REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

“When Greek meets Greek then comes the tug of war.”

SIR,—Whatever be the ultimate fate of the Revision movement (which seems just now hanging in the balance) one thing is certain—the name of Bishop Baring will go down to posterity inseparably connected with the occasion, as having displayed an amount of moral courage rarely exhibited by those in place of authority in the Church. He has dared to espouse an unpopular cause. He has not shrunk from openly expressing his opinions, though he has reason to believe “his views do not coincide with those of the large majority of his reverend brethren.”* He might have added, “of his *right* reverend brethren,”—if we may believe all that has been said of them by those who are determined, *coûte qu’il coûte*, that “the Prayer-book shall not be touched in their day.”

It is barely six months since the Bishop of Oxford, in

Convocation; nor will our breaches ever be healed but by a true English Parliament.” (Life of Calamy, vol. i., p. 204.)

* Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Baring, now Bishop of Durham); p. 14. Seeley, London. 1860.

almost insulting language, bid Lord Ebury not to trouble Israel any longer, seeing that "their lordships (the Bishops,* we presume) had determined not to give their sanction to his proposal." And yet here behold an ally starting from the episcopal ranks in most admired disorder, bringing an amount of support in aid of the noble lord such as he little dreamed of receiving from any of the right reverend prelates; and such arguments as will carry a moral weight with the public more than counterbalancing all the forcibly-feeble oratory of his chief opponent.

It is true, the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately†) and the Bishop of Durham (Villiers‡) have of late not obscurely hinted to their respective clergy that the time for further resistance to revision is gone by, and that it would be well to yield to a cry founded on reason and common sense. But we cannot say that the trumpet of either of those eminent individuals has given forth the clear sound that has issued from the episcopal chair at Gloucester within the present month, and which has met ere this with responsive echoes from every quarter of the kingdom. At any rate, we have at this moment the most conspicuous of the Irish prelates, one of the most noted of the English northern bishops, and a bishop of the province of Canterbury, against whom the tongue of envy can say no evil, pledged to the advocacy of revision, and, what is more,—“at this present time.” Away, then, with the bugbear of the “unanimity of the bishops against the measure”—a falsehood from the beginning, and now not bearing a shadow of the semblance of truth.

* The Bishop of Oxford would seem to have undertaken to speak in the name of the entire British peerage. See Letter xvi., p. 150.

† See Letters LXXXVIII.—XCI., pp. 107—124.

‡ This prelate was shortly afterwards removed by death; but his place being supplied by Bishop Baring, it may be said—

“Uno avulso non deficit alter
Aureus, et simili splendet virga metallo.”

And then for another alleged "difficulty," which we have heard put into the mouth of one high lately in her Majesty's councils—"A Commission!—Where on earth am I to find the men to form a Commission?"*

Behold here the *nucleus* of an efficient Commission. Ireland represented by her most learned and most distinguished divine (Whately). The province of York by a prelate standing as high in position as he does in the esteem of the people of those parts (Longley). The province of Canterbury by a bishop second to none in his antecedents,† and whose age is just that which gives the greatest amount of mental power, combined with soberness of judgment, experience, and knowledge of the world.

If a competent Commission cannot be constructed upon such a foundation, we have yet to learn what qualifications are requisite for that mysterious and almost fabulous body. Let these three individuals have the nominating of two clergymen apiece as their coadjutors, and let the Minister of the day, under the correction of his colleagues, add thereto four laymen (one at least of whom should be learned in the canon law), and behold at once a solution of the problem. Behold thirteen Commissioners, of whom five or seven to form a working quorum—*et voilà tout!*‡

We shall not enter at present into the details of the Bishop of Gloucester's charge, but we shall hope to recur to it on a future occasion. Meanwhile, our exhortation to those

* This is undeniably a considerable difficulty; but should not be more insurmountable now than on former occasions.

† Bishop Baring was a double first-class man in 1829, and was popular as a preacher in Marylebone before his elevation to the Bench in 1856.

‡ The sanction of a *clear majority* of the whole should be sufficient for drawing up the report of the Commission. It is ridiculous to look for *unanimity* in such a matter; and the *Protests* annexed to the Report of the Commission of 1867-70 effectually annulled any good it might otherwise have done,—small as it was at the best. See APPENDIX to Vol. I., p. 427.

who have fought side by side with us through evil report and through good report in this uphill battle, is this—Be united, be moderate, be persevering :—

“ Nil sine magno
Vita labore dedit mortalibus.”

Let not weariness seize upon your spirits on account of the protracted nature of the campaign, for assuredly in due season we shall reap if we faint not. We want not now for leaders, as was once the case with us ; let it not be said that the leaders failed for want of unity, good sense, and moderation in the ranks of their followers.*

I remain, yours, &c.,

Oct. 26, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER XCIX.

BISHOP BARING ON THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

“But soft, behold, lo where he comes again.”—HAMLET.

SIR,—The Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol being now published by authority,† it is desirable for those who are interested (as which of us is not) in the satisfactory settlement of this matter to study it carefully, as being upon the whole, perhaps, the most important document which has yet appeared in advocacy of the measure.

We say, “the most important *upon the whole*”—as it at once dispels the bugbear of Episcopal Unanimity against the entertainment of the subject, which has been long made use of as a Mumbo Jumbo by the Anti-Revisionists, to deter people

* Perhaps the greatest “difficulty” the cause has to contend with is the determination of some Revisionists to have *all they ask for, or nothing*.

† A Charge delivered at the triennial visitation of the diocese, Oct., 1860. By Charles (Baring), Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Seeley.

from giving their minds to its consideration. So long as it could be made to appear that the bishops were *unanimous* against Revision,* so long was it thought by many hopeless to attempt it; however plainly the case might have been set forth in Parliament by its undaunted champion, or however unanswerably its expediency might have been demonstrated in all the pamphlets, articles, and letters with which the press has teemed for the last five or six years.

Bishop Baring has come forward at a most seasonable moment to revive the spirits of those who were beginning to despair of obtaining a hearing; and to scatter dismay amongst the ranks of those who were flattering themselves that their Fabian policy had tired out, if it had not conquered, their opponents.

The Bishop observes that "the further Revision of the Liturgy has been strongly recommended by persons of learning and piety at various times since the last Revision of 1662. Indeed, *all true friends of the Church must, in the abstract, be advocates of Revision.*" (Charge, p. 14.)

This is calling a spade a spade. It is the boldest assertion, connected with the subject, that we have yet met with. And though the Charge has been now delivered above a month, we have not heard of any one rash enough to step forth from the opposing phalanx, to pick up the glove thus manfully thrown down.

"There is no one," proceeds the Bishop, "who can deny that there are some alterations which would render the Prayer-book more perfect. Every one must esteem it as a service done to the Church of no little moment, if any defect in her ritual were remedied, any acknowledged deficiency

* The Bishop of Oxford is fully alive to the value of the above exaggeration. "If," says he, "the authority of a body is shaken by those within it, we cannot hope to be much respected by those without." (Speech in Convocation, May 14, 1861.)

supplied, any change made by which, without the sacrifice of what is essential, the prejudices of separatists might be removed, and the peace and unity of the Church secured."

Believing this to be the single object of Lord Ebury's repeated motions in the House of Lords, we are astonished that they should have met with so little favour from the Episcopal Bench. We suppose the solution of this problem lies in what the Bishop of Gloucester* designates as "*the unnatural fears* of many good and wise Churchmen that, the work of Revision once commenced, a door may be opened to innovations which would strip the Church of England of those characteristic features which endear her to her members, and render her in their judgment the safe guide and sound instructress of all who will submit themselves to her teaching."

This being the only issue raised by the Bishop, the question is very much simplified; and to this issue, we are persuaded, it must come at last. The whole difficulty in this case resolves itself into the judgment exercised in the primary selection of the Commission (as asked for by the noble lord), and the discretion shown by the Commissioners, when selected.

They could not adopt a better rule for their proceedings than that laid down by the Bishop, namely, "*to reject all needless alterations, and to abandon no essential truth* through a desire to render the Church more comprehensive." With such a pole-star for their guidance, it would be difficult for them to go far astray. They would have the great advantage of the Report of the Commission of 1689 as a beacon by which to steer their course, pointing out as it does (upon the

* So called for the sake of brevity. It is to be regretted on many accounts that the See is not again disjoined from that of Bristol. A meeting was held for that purpose in Bristol, Jan. 1877, the Mayor presiding; but it does not appear that any further steps have been taken to accomplish the object in view.

nonum prematur in annum principle) errors to be avoided, as well as furnishing hints well worthy of adoption.

The Bishop gives it as his opinion that *the present time** so far from being unpropitious, is a most favourable one for the work of Revision; founding his chief argument upon the celebrated declaration of the Ten Thousand, that “any attempt, *at the present time*, to alter the Book of Common

* As the argument drawn from *this present time* is the most hackneyed of all in reference to this question, it is worth while to consider the view taken of it by so great a master in Israel as the Archbishop of Dublin.

“It is far from being sufficient, as seems to be the notion of some persons, to show that the present is not the *fittest conceivable* occasion for taking a certain step. Besides this, it is requisite to show, not merely that a better occasion may be *imagined*, or that a better occasion is *past*,—that the Sibylline books might have been purchased cheaper *some time ago*; but that a more suitable occasion is likely to arise *hereafter*, and *how soon*; and also, that the mischief which may be *going on during the interval* will be more than compensated by the superior suitableness of that future occasion—in short, that it will have been worth waiting for. And, in addition to all this, it is requisite to show also the probability that when this golden opportunity shall arise, men will be more *disposed to take advantage* of it than they have heretofore appeared to be; that they will not again fall into apathetic security and fondness for indefinite procrastination.

“This last point is as needful to be established as any, for it is remarkable that those who deprecate taking any step *just now*, in these times of extraordinary excitement, did not, on those former occasions, come forward to propose taking advantage of a comparatively calmer state of things. They neither made any call, nor responded to the call of others.

“And, indeed, all experience seems to show—comparing the apathy on the subject, which was so general at those periods, with the altered state of feeling now existing—that a great and pressing emergency, and *nothing else*, will induce men to take any step in this matter; and that a period of discussion and perplexing difficulty is, though not *in itself* the most suitable occasion for such a step, yet, constituted as human nature is, the best, because the *only* occasion on which one can hope that it will be taken. A season of famine may have been, in some respects, a bad occasion for altering the corn laws, but experience showed that nothing less would suffice.

* * * * *

“Who can say that a large proportion of those who are now irrecoverably alienated from the Church, might not have been at this moment sound members of it had timely steps been taken, not by any departure from the principles of our Reformers, but by following more closely the track they marked out for us?”—*Whately's Annotations on Bacon's Essays*, p. 271. London: 1860.

Prayer would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church.”*

It appears, on the contrary, to the Bishop of Gloucester, and many both of the laity and clergy will agree with his lordship, “that the very fact of such a document having been signed so numerously by the clergy of all sections of the Church, is the most conclusive evidence that we may enter with safety upon measures of amendment; as the existence and manifestation of this strong conservative feeling will be our best security against frivolous changes, or dangerous innovations.”

Bishop Baring was a double first-class man in his day. Hence the clearness of his reasoning, founded as it is upon common sense. Without wishing to disparage the understanding of those who are unable to boast of a similar academical distinction, or without meaning to assert that all wisdom lies in a *double first*, we are yet persuaded that the academical test is sound in the main; and that a certain amount of mathematical ballast is essential in correcting the judgment, just as a certain amount of classical reading is valuable in bringing the experience of the ancient to bear upon the practical working of the modern world.

“Arithmetic,” says Sydney Smith, “is the natural cure of fear;” and a few lessons in geometry would probably not come amiss to those who have drawn a different conclusion to the Bishop’s from the manifesto of the immortal Ten Thousand.† When one clergyman out of every two takes an opposite side on this much-agitated question, a little reflection should allay all fear, as serving to show that now, if ever,

* See Letter LXXI., p. 7.

† We regret to find the Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant) arguing in his Charge of November, 1860, in opposition to the views of his right rev. brother in this matter. See Charge, pp. 58-9. Rivingtons.

is the time to prevent either party taking advantage of the occasion to depress the other or to exalt themselves.

We must reserve the remainder of the Bishop's Charge for a future occasion; meanwhile, we commend it to the attentive perusal of the thirteen thousand Clergy* *who have as yet pronounced no opinion* on the question, and in whose hands, therefore (as far as the clerical element is concerned), the decision may be said at this moment to rest.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Nov. 2, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER C.

THE BISHOP OF DERRY, AND OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

“By mutual confidence and mutual aid
Great deeds are done and great discoveries made;
The wise new prudence from the wise acquire,
And one brave hero fans another's fire.”—POPE.

SIR,—Concluding our remarks upon the Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, we find his lordship urging the present aspect of the religious world as an argument for making at once certain alterations in the form of divine worship as at present prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.

It is impossible for the most rigid opponent of Revision to deny that there is a marked desire on the part of many of the clergy to carry the Gospel among those masses of the people who have hitherto seemed regardless, or out of reach, of all religious impressions. It is equally undeniable that the attempts of such clergy to accomplish their object

* Assuming, which there is good reason to do, that the Clergy of the United Kingdom amount on the whole to not less than 23,000.

have been sore let and hindered by the restrictions imposed by the Act of Uniformity. They are trammelled at every step by some Rubric or other;* they are met at every turn by "the Book, the whole Book, and nothing but the Book."

Accordingly the Bishop of Gloucester, sympathising in this Evangelical movement—as what sincere Christian would not?—advises such a modification of the Act of 1662 as would at least allow each Bishop the privilege of sanctioning, within the bounds of his own diocese, the use of some abbreviated form of public worship, adapted to occasions as they arise;† while he secures against too wide a departure from the terms of conformity, by requiring that such form should in every case be compiled from the existing Book of Common Prayer.

On this matter not a few of the Bishops would be found to agree. Indeed, we can hardly conceive any of them openly professing dissent from such a proposition. For example, the Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Higgin), in his Charge of the present summer, which was looked upon at the time of its delivery as an *anti*-revisionist manifesto, was constrained to admit that "there were in the Liturgy of our Church, as at present used, some needless repetitions; some parts inconveniently long, and some of the services used together which might be more profitably separated."

In the plan proposed by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol these objections would doubtless be eliminated. The same would be the case with regard to the other "imperfections" pointed out by the Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.

"Admirable," proceeds that prelate, "as is the Prayer-

* Even the Bishop of Oxford found out this, to his cost, in his "injunction" to the clergy of his diocese in the matter of the American war, Oct. 1862.

† This point, too, was carried by the Revisionists, and is now pretty generally acted on. (1878.)

book in general, and bound up as it is in the hearts and affections of the people, it is useless to contend that it is incapable of improvement. It must be admitted that in some instances its language might be made more plain; the Rubric might be explained; the Lessons revised;* and the Services made more suitable for daily devotion. If the Revision aims at no more than this, it is only to be hoped that it will be effected by proper and conscientious authorities.”†

We have nothing to say against this, except that it does not go far enough. The Bishop of Gloucester enters more at large upon the question of “explaining the Rubric,” to which his brother of Derry so briefly refers. He expresses his regret that a morbid conscientiousness, on the part of a few misguided members of the Church, should have led them to introduce novelties into their mode of conducting public worship, under the impression that they were thus simply conforming to the directions laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, to which they have given their unfeigned assent and consent. The result of such “conformity” is but too well known; we will give it, however, in the Bishop’s words:—

“The suspicions of the laity have been roused, their confidence in the Church shaken, and a general desire felt that such a Revision of the Rubrics should be carried out as shall render them consistent with one another, and insure a distinct declaration of the rule of our Church in all ritual details connected with the celebration of public worship.”

Thus far, then, we may consider the Irish and the English prelate agreed; and as there cannot be a doubt that they both of them speak the sentiments of several of

* This has been done. See before, Letter LXXXIX., p. 113.

† Charge by the Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, at his visitation, Aug. 1860.

their brethren,* it can only be a matter of time—and we hope that time not a very protracted one—before relief is given upon these points, whatever may be the fate of the weightier matters upon which the Bishop of Gloucester next proceeds to speak.

These are the Occasional offices of the Church; the Burial and the Baptismal Services, the Ordinal, and the Visitation of the Sick; in all of which his lordship expresses it as his opinion that it is desirable “slight verbal alterations should be made, such as would sacrifice no essential truth, and would yet do more than any other measure to bring back to our Church the allegiance of those who now reject her authority, and to retain the confidence of her lay members.”

We must here beg our readers to consult the Charge for themselves. Never was the case put more clearly, and in fewer words. The whole of the controversy, which has occupied many hundred pages under other hands, is here condensed into as many lines, which may be accepted as an indication of the good sense, temper, and catholic spirit of the right reverend author.

His lordship concludes by observing, that “although the failure of former attempts at Revision might seem to exclude all hope of future success, yet inasmuch as he believes the conviction is a growing one of the necessity of the union and co-operation of all members of Christ’s Church throughout the land, in order to meet the threatening assaults of neology and infidelity, he does not despair of seeing the day when, after calm and full consideration, our Church will freely make such changes in her occasional services as

* Archdeacon Allen, of Salop, writes, August 24, 1863: “The notion that the Prayer-book is not to be touched seems to me to have its root in unbelief, to be not according to reason, and not according to Scripture. The Church lives and grows, and, as we hope, will receive guidance and strength for the work that is her trust. She is not a house of cards of which, if a corner be touched, all is in ruins.”

may enable large numbers of orthodox Dissenters gladly to avail themselves of the opportunity of reunion, and of becoming worshippers with us in the same house of prayer, in the same sound words of our Scriptural Liturgy.”*

To make comparisons has always been considered objectionable. But it is irresistible, on the present occasion, not to invite our readers to contrast the above sentence with the sentiments of a certain member of the Episcopal Bench, who spoke in opposition to Lord Ebury during the late Session.†

We have now not a *lay peer* only, but a *right reverend prelate*, of talents and piety equal to those of any on the bench, “endangering (according to the views of the Bishop of Oxford) the interests of the Church, by stirring up a question, *the mere discussion of which*, from time to time, is by no means so harmless a proceeding as some people imagine.”

We have a Bishop, in the prime and vigour of manhood and intellect, fully aware of “the greatness and gravity of the subject he is treating,”—not “moved by the tail,” but acting on the dictates of his own head, and charitable and comprehensive heart,—“thinking it no difficult matter to alter a few things in the Prayer-book that do not (and even some points that do) touch upon doctrine”:—a Bishop, too (let us add), who is as fully aware as the Bishop of Oxford, “that the addition of a single word to the Creed of Christendom was sufficient to divide the Eastern and Western Churches, and to cause that great and mighty rent which not even the lapse of centuries has sufficed to close,”—and

* Some of the clergy in the diocese of Llandaff “*do not believe* that any Dissenters would be won over to the Church by *any* Revision that might take place.” See petition presented in the Convocation of Feb., 1861, by the Bishop of Llandaff. But, as we have before said, *belief* (as well as *assertion*) is not *proof*.

† See Speech of the Bishop of Oxford in reply to Lord Ebury, in the House of Lords, May 8th, 1860.

which "great and mighty rent," we may be allowed to say, in conclusion, never will be closed, so long as the policy of the last-mentioned prelate is preferred to that of the one whose Charge we have undertaken to review.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Nov. 7th, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER CI.

CHARGE OF THE BISHOP OF OXFORD (WILBERFORCE),
NOVEMBER, 1860.

"Charity and meekness, lord,
Become a Churchman better than ambition."

SHAKESPEARE (*Henry VIII.*).

SIR,—Reading the other day the Life of Bishop Coplestone, I met with the following in a letter addressed to that prelate by the late Lord Goderich:—"I had long thought that a *great* reform could only be obviated by the timely adoption of *minor* measures. That policy was not pursued by Parliament, and not only was every modification of our representative system refused as unnecessary, but its very abuses defended as merits and advantages."*

It does not, surely, require any great depth of wisdom to profit by the lesson contained in the above passage. All that is wanted is for one to carry the memory back just thirty years, and to apply the experience of one's youth to the occurrences of our riper age.

Unfortunately, however, bishops (and particularly, as it would seem, the Bishop of Oxford) have so much else to do, that they are apt to live from hand to mouth, taking little or

* Letter of Lord Goderich to the late Bishop of Llandaff, Nov. 24, 1831. (Life of Bishop Coplestone, p. 145.)

no thought of yesterday, whatever they may do of to-morrow. The late Bishop of Llandaff, for example, from whose interesting Life our quotation is taken, confesses that he was quite in the dark as to the amount of popular feeling on the subject of the Reform Bill, till he was roused from his torpor by the firing of the Bishop's Palace and the Mansion House at Bristol :—

“One thing,” he naïvely observes, “I will frankly acknowledge, namely, that I was in error as to the degree and the extensive prevalence of public opinion on this subject ; not understanding, as I now do, what a strong hold the question had acquired on the minds of the middle classes, and of those just above them.”*

Awaking, however, from his lethargy, or sleep of death, —for everybody else seems to have been wide awake,—he takes the precaution (upon the warning of his servants that his house might possibly be attacked) to provide himself with “a round hat, and a brown great-coat,” in case it should be expedient for him to escape over the fields at the back of his residence.

Now we are fully aware that the question of a Revision of the Prayer-book is never likely to be attended by such an amount of popular demonstration as the revision of the franchise.† People, unfortunately, care far more about the privilege of voting at the hustings, than they do about how the Services are conducted in their parish church ; and upon this state of things we imagine the Bishop of Oxford presumes, or he would hardly persist as he does in following out the Duke of Wellington's suicidal policy of 1831, and so letting slip the golden opportunity (according to Lord

* Life of Bishop Coplestone, p. 148.

† And yet the riots at St. George's-in-the-East in 1860, and at St. James's, Hatcham, in 1877, show that the public are not so apathetic on this matter as some would fain have us believe.

Goderich's maxim) of "staving off a *great* reform by the *timely* adoption of *minor* measures."

NO SURRENDER, is still the watchword of the Bishop of Oxford* :—

"Any change once begun could not be final; every concession would only form the ground-work for a new attack on the part of some one who was left out of the concession, and *the clamour for the change would never rest while anything was left to change.*"†

This is Toryism by the vengeance! This is verily to carry us back thirty years in our history. Ye shades of Sibthorp and of Wetherell, how must ye have gibbered as these accents flowed from the honied lips of the Cuddesdon Protectionist :—

"Hear from the grave, renowned Eldon, hear!
They breathe a soul to animate thy clay."

"It was their duty, therefore," proceeds the Bishop, "*to resist innocent alterations, because the risks attending change would far outweigh any small advantages that might accrue from it.*"‡

Retain, by all means, your Gattons and Old Sarums of

* On the folly, as well as the danger, of the NO SURRENDER principle, see a speech on the Church Rate question by Mr. A. J. B. Hope, January, 1861. Ridgway, London: p. 15.

† The same argument was adopted by the bishops in the reign of Queen Mary against amending the abuse of relics, images, pilgrimages, and the like. "If," say they, "we once confess any errors at all, they will straightway cry out that many other things are worthy to be reformed, besides those which we shall yield unto them, and so they will be growing upon us that we shall never have done reforming."—*Life of Bernard Gilpin* (1727), p. 55.

‡ The same sentiment had been previously uttered by his lordship in Convocation, Feb. 9, 1859 :—"I do not ask you to *touch the Prayer-book*. My opinions have not changed as to the importance of maintaining the Book of Common Prayer *unaltered*. In the present state of the Church it would be *madness to attempt its alteration.*"

the Prayer-book as long as you can. Despise the voice of those who warn you that your idols may be torn violently away, and with them go, perchance, the Church Catechism,* two of the Creeds, the Thirty-nine Articles,—in short, all distinctions and definitions of faith. The Bishop foresees some such a contingency, when he points his finger to a cloud in the horizon,—somewhat larger, we apprehend, than a man's hand,—gathering fast and thick around the Church:—

“We live in a time when persons are heard to declare that belief in the Atonement is a misconception; that the miracles narrated in Scripture are parts of a system of naturalism which it is the duty of remorseless criticism to unveil and discover; that the imagination has allied itself to the affections to produce a belief in them; and that they may be simply brought down to a rational naturalism by such expressions as this—‘The description of the passage of the Red Sea is the latitude of poetry.’

“When the history of the Bible has been explained away by treating it as a legend; when it is attempted to deprive it of its supernatural character by turning it into a history of past events; when we are taught that men may sign the Articles of the Church, although in their own opinion they differ from them,—surely it is time”—for what?—to see that these Articles and the Prayer-book contain nothing in them which can be justly controverted or excepted against, or which may not be easily and satisfactorily improved?—No; but,—“for all true Churchmen to unite together in defence of Holy Scripture as the one inspired revelation, to lay aside even all suspicions of division in small matters; lest whilst they are disputing about

* One of the propositions of the Prayer-book Remodelled, 1860, is to totally change the structure of the Church Catechism; another is to omit one of the Creeds; and a third, to reduce the Thirty-nine Articles to twenty. See Letter ciii., p. 192.

the lesser matters of the law, they should be robbed un-
 awares of the true foundation of their faith.”*

You are confounding two things, my lord—I speak with
 all respect—which have no necessary connexion with one
 another; and never will have any, if other voices than your
 own are allowed to prevail in this matter. The rationalist,
 the neologist, the infidel, and the atheist (if such a being
 exist), have nothing to do with the present call for a Re-
 vision of the Prayer-book. What connexion they may
 ultimately have with it, if a deaf ear is for ever turned to
 the voice of reason and common sense, we pretend not
 to say—

“For danger levels man and brute;
 And all are fellows in their need.”

A common cause, a common slight, or a common injury,
 will often unite the very opposite elements of society.†
 Despair is a powerful ingredient in most revolutions. The
 worm will turn being trod upon. The timid stag will gore
 the huntsman when driven to stand at bay. Let the Bishop
 beware how he provokes a combination of parties, now far
 as the poles asunder, while calling upon his hearers to be
 “united in defence of the faith.”

The faith, my lord, is not attacked; but common sense
 is outraged, and patience is driven to rebel.

The Bishop himself admits it as a sign of the times, and
 a sad one it is, that “the number of men endowed with the

* Certainly, Bishop Colenso’s “Examination into the Pentateuch” is
 a remarkable illustration of the Bishop of Oxford’s statement in the text;
 but we draw a totally different conclusion from the premises to that arrived
 at by Bishop Wilberforce.

† It was the common dread of the Turk which made an United Ger-
 many, in the fifteenth century, out of many previously disjointed and
 even hostile States. See the full and interesting “History of Protestantism”
 by WYLIE; Cassell & Co., London; 1878.

highest gifts of intellect,* who should give themselves to the Christian ministry, is smaller than it was forty years ago, a fact which threatens to lower the standard of the English clergy permanently as to theological learning, and generally as to intellectual things.”

Does not his lordship see that the cause of this degeneration lies in the greater enlightenment and knowledge of the age we live in? That men of intelligence will not, now-a-days, come servilely forward and set their seal, at the age of three or four-and-twenty, to the entire Thirty-nine Articles, and give their “unfeigned Assent and Consent to all and everything” *without inquiry?*—And *if* they inquire, is it not more than probable that they will discover—what those who have been ordained above thirty years ago, like the Bishop, must have ascertained long ere this—that there are some things in the Book of Common Prayer which *require* amendment, many things in it which *admit* of improvement, much that *might* be so altered as to give satisfaction to millions?

But we cannot be for ever treading the same ground. So we must here take leave of our unreforming prelate of the nineteenth century. One bright spot, however, we do discover in this lengthy Charge, which is that the Bishop of Oxford no longer speaks of the “unanimity of the Bench,” and their determination that “the Prayer-book shall *not be touched* ;”—while he has also the grace not to

* And not only these, but even candidates of *any kind* for the ministry are annually on the decline. See the *Guardian* of Dec., 1876.

A correspondent of the *Law Times*, Sept., 1878, writes, “That a large class of persons who formerly sent their sons to the Church have, since the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, sent them into the legal profession. *It is certain that the number of those who annually present themselves for ordination has decreased during the last few years, whilst within the last three or four years an increase of about 300 has taken place in the number who have joined the ranks of the solicitors.*”

boast of the manifesto of the Ten Thousand, got up about this time last year—under whose *dictation* we will not say, but certainly under the *leadership* of his lordship's Examining Chaplain, the Very Rev. Chenevix Trench, Dean of Westminster.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Nov. 14, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

P.S.—The statement of the Bishop of Oxford, with regard to the class of candidates offering for holy orders, is unfortunately corroborated by the testimony of Professor Stanley,* Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, and Dr. Vaughan,† late Head Master of Harrow.

Professor Stanley observes:—

“Why is it that the number of gifted minds and loftier characters—those who from their knowledge, their power, their love of truth, are most fitted, and would most naturally be attracted to the study of theology, or to the ranks of the clergy of our Church—are, in this sphere, so few, so very few within the last ten years, compared with what they were in former days?”

“The fact as regards the present time, and this place (Oxford), is, I fear, undoubted.”

Dr. Vaughan, in his “Memorials of Harrow Sundays,” says:—

“I fear it cannot be denied that there is a great and extensive shaking of men's minds at this time as to the truth and authority of the Christian doctrine. We see it with great sorrow. It is indicated in many ways. To think only of our own class of society, *it is intimated not obscurely by a great and growing indisposition, on the part of young men otherwise admirably qualified for it, to the profession of a clergyman.* How many of those whose character, whose gifts, whose education, and we are sure, also (in some cases), whose inclination destined them for that useful and honourable service, are seen to turn away from it when the time comes! Anything rather than that; no obscurity, no drudgery, no want of attractiveness, and no want of direct usefulness, is enough to deter them from any other calling, so they may escape the necessity of declaring themselves to believe all the articles of the Christian faith, or to assent with all their hearts to the prescribed order of our Church's worship.”†

* Now respectively, Dean of Westminster, and Master of the Temple (1878).

† The above references are taken from Lord Ebury's speech in the

LETTER CII.

THE "ASSENT AND CONSENT." WHAT DOES IT IMPLY?*

"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."—Rom. xiv. 5.

SIR,—It is some time since we have found leisure to notice any of the numerous pamphlets that have come forth of late upon the Revision question. Between the speeches delivered in the House of Lords, in May last, and the subsequent charges of bishops and archbishops, you will admit that there has been work enough for more than one pen, and mine has not been idle.

The announcement, however, of a Second Edition of the tract whose title we have given above, reminds us that we should be guilty of neglect towards the cause whose advocacy we have undertaken, if we did not devote one of these Letters to a review of its contents.

The author, though anonymous (which we regret), appears to be an Irish beneficed clergyman; and he sets out by announcing that he is one of those many divines who have, as required by law,† declared their "unfeigned assent and consent to *all and everything* contained and prescribed in and by

House of Lords, May 8, 1860. (Hatchard and Co.; p. 26.) The Bishop of Winchester (Sumner) in his late Charge, Nov., 1862, while still unaccountably resisting a Revision of the Prayer-book, is constrained to "regret that *fewer men than formerly come from the Universities to offer themselves as candidates for holy orders.*" Cannot his lordship see the connexion here between cause and effect? Every Bishop on the Bench is now constrained, however reluctantly, to ordain a greater number of so-called "Literates," who are often the most illiterate among the candidates for holy orders. But necessity knows no law. (1878.) See Letter cxxxiii.

* By an Irish Clergyman. Second Edition. London: Nisbet. 1860.

† The Act of Uniformity of 1662 required this declaration to be made by all the clergy on institution to a benefice.

the book intituled ‘The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland.’”

This declaration he has had, by his own showing, to make more than once; and though he does not give out, with Dr. Robinson of Blackburn,* that he is “ready to repeat it *toties quoties*,” yet one would think he implies as much, when he significantly adds, “Had I failed to make this declaration I should have no legal hold on any benefice, nor any power, right, or title to live on its glebe, take its emoluments, or enjoy any of the advantages that may be connected with the position of a Rector of the Established Church.”

One thing, at any rate, is certain, that the author must either remain quietly where he is (which he does not seem at all disposed to do), or, in the event of any better preferment being offered him, must submit to a repetition of the same process,† which, to judge from the tenor of his pamphlet, would be anything but agreeable to his feelings.

It is surely, therefore, deserving of consideration on the part of those who have the carrying out the law of the Church in this respect, whether the statements of this clergyman are or are not founded on fact; and if they are, whether the time has not arrived when this stringent clause of the Act of Uniformity should be modified, or the Prayer-book itself

* See Vol. I., Letter LXVIII., p. 406.

† An interesting anecdote, to the point, is told in the Life of Edmund Calamy, vol. i., p. 265. (Edit. 1829.) A good living becoming vacant in the gift of Sir Philip Gell, in Derbyshire, he offered it first to a Nonconformist, hoping he might be induced to conform and accept it: upon his declining, the living was next offered to a neighbouring clergyman, who also declined on the following grounds: that, “though he had no scruple, when he took possession of his present living, against giving his assent and consent, and was not willing to lose the capacity of service he was in by that means, yet, *as to giving his assent and consent anew*, he had such objections against it as he could not get over.” Dr. Samuel Clarke said the same.

brought more into unison with the advanced intelligence of the age.

We are no rationalists, no neologists, no Puritans, no Puseyites, nor any other *-ist*, *-an*, or *-ite*, that we are aware of. And yet we take upon ourselves—as the type of a plain Englishman, of good ordinary education, and endowed, by the blessing of God, with the *mens sana in corpore sano*—to assert, that the Irish clergyman has submitted, in the course of his thirty pages, a *primâ facie* case that there are in the Book of Common Prayer several things to which, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, it is difficult (to say the least of it) for a thinking man to give this said “unfeigned Assent and Consent.”

To allege, as is sometimes done, that the passages to which this remark applies are few and insignificant, is only to proclaim the more loudly that they ought to be amended, and the obstruction to conformity removed. It was but a trifle William Tell was called upon to conform to, in being asked to bow before a hat stuck upon a pole ; and yet a free man of the fourteenth century would not consent to be a party to such a piece of tomfoolery and bodily degradation. He felt that a great principle was involved in the seeming trifle, and he resisted ; and his resistance led to the emancipation of a whole nation from slavery.

It is not wise at any time, and certainly is not adapted to this independent age in which it is our privilege to live, to neglect “the day of little things.” And the fact of these “little things” having of late attracted so great a degree of attention, and roused so much public excitement, is (or should be) a warning to wise men not to turn a deaf ear to them, but to give heed to them betimes, and to remove the grievance while still removable with comparative safety.

The pamphlet being concise and comprehensive, it would be simply to re-write its pages, if we attempted to enter at

any length into its contents. Suffice it to say, that the author recapitulates most of the points to which attention has been called by the advocates for a *doctrinal* Revision of the Prayer-book; more particularly by Messrs. Fisher, Gell, and the Derbyshire petitioners.

One of his strongest points is that well-worn one of the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick:—on which we will say no more than this, that when the Prayer-book itself furnishes another form, questioned by none, and admired by all for its simplicity, it seems (to say the least of it) hardly worth while to retain a bone of contention, whose withdrawal would be attended by neither “wound” nor “scar,”* but be merely the replacement of one passage of the Prayer-book by another from the same source.

The author, after fully stating his case, concludes by putting the question, WHAT, then, IS TO BE DONE? Which he answers thus: “We must demand earnestly and loudly and strain every nerve to obtain—

- (1) The repeal of the Act of Uniformity;
- (2) The alteration of the terms of Subscription;
- (3) The Revision of the Prayer-book.”

With regard to *this last*,† which is the point to which our own attention has throughout the whole of this controversy been more immediately directed, he makes the following very just observation, which we shall quote *in extenso*:—

“The *argumentum ad verecundiam* will be brought to play against us, and we shall be asked whether the Liturgy and the services that satisfied the long roll of worthies, who have lived and ministered and died in the communion of the United Church, may not satisfy us. But by such a line of argument

* See Letter xci., pp. 121-124.

† The Bishop of Worcester (Philpott), in his Charge of October, 1862, very properly observes that nothing can give ultimate satisfaction except a revision of the rules and rubrics from which all the difficulty arises.

as is implied here, if yielded to, all reformation, all improvement, at each period of the Church's history, might (nay *would*, most certainly) have been arrested."*

We hold this reasoning to be unanswerable, and therefore utterly repudiate the citation of such authorities as Hooker, Taylor,† and the like, as being of the slightest weight on the present occasion. Had the Hookers and Taylors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries been alive now, they are just the men whose strong mind and sound sense would have led them to grapple with the difficulties of the position, and enabled them to overcome them.

Finally, as to "the fear of separation and schism, if alteration takes place;" the author trusts to God to take care of His own, and is willing, while doing *his duty*, to leave results to Him.

In this last sentiment we heartily concur, and recommending it to all timid lovers of their Prayer-book, we remain,

Yours, &c.,

Nov. 24, 1860.

"INGOLDSBY."

* Assent and Consent, &c., p. 28. This deponent sayeth true.

† Taylor is one of the "authorities" thus often paraded by the opponents of Revision; and yet he observes, in reference to the Athanasian Creed,—“I find no opinions in Scripture called damnable but what are impious in practical matters or directly destructive of the faith or body of Christianity. The censures in the preface and end of the Creed of Athanasius are arguments of the zeal and strength of persuasion of the author, but they are foreign and accidental to the articles, and might as well have been spared. And, indeed, to me it seems very hard to put uncharitableness into the Creed, and so to make it become as an article of faith.” And again, “There is an admirable precedent in the Apostles' Creed, to show us that those creeds are best, which keep the very words of Scripture, and that *that faith is best which hath greatest simplicity*; that it is better in all cases humbly to submit than curiously to inquire and pry into the mystery under the cloud. If the Nicene fathers had done so too, possibly the Church would never have repented it.” Chillingworth says,—“The damnatory sentences of St. Athanasius's Creed are most false, and also in a high degree presumptuous and schismatical.”—*Life of Chillingworth*, pp. 78, 81. Edit. 1725.

See further remarks on the Athanasian Creed, Vol. I., Letter xxii., p. 155. Vol. II., Lett. lxxv., pp. 30-31; lxxxix., p. 115.

LETTER CIII.

“THE PRAYER-BOOK REMODELLED.”*

“It is almost morally impossible that a Book of Prayers composed three hundred years ago, should be equally well adapted for general use now. Our modes of thinking and expression, our very sensibilities, differ in certain respects from those of our ancestors; and it would be strange indeed, if a book written in their days should, with our different feelings, and in our altered circumstances, require no revision.”—*Introduction to Prayer-book Remodelled*, p. 1.

SIR,—It has been often asked of the advocates for Revision, “*What is it you want?—State your grievance, and the proposed remedy for it.*”

Answers to this question have been given in various ways by various writers, “according (to use the Bishop of Oxford’s curious phrase, Vol. I., p. 97) to their peculiar views of truth.” But never hitherto has the question been so fully, so temperately, and so fearlessly replied to, as in the short tract of 112 pages now lying before us.†

To examining its contents, as far as our limits will allow, we shall now address ourselves; stating as we proceed, with perfect candour (and in entire ignorance of the author), wherein we agree with, and wherein we differ from, the views set forth in the work.

Its main object will be best understood from the author’s own statement, as given in the Introduction (p. 16), with the sentiments of which we in the main cordially agree:—

“It is in the hope of accomplishing what William of

* “The Prayer-book Remodelled, and Adapted to the Men and Circumstances of the Present Time. An experiment, addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, and to candid sober-minded men of all denominations.” Rev. A. Jenour, Blackpool, Lancashire. Longmans, 1860.

† See also a Letter to a Member of Parliament by the Rev. Charles Girdlestone; March, 1862. London: 17, Buckingham Street, Adelphi.

Orange—to whom, let Englishmen remember, by God's blessing, they are indebted for the preservation of their liberties and their religion—attempted in vain,* that we put forth this book. We would act openly. We do not wish to conceal that its real object is to conciliate Dissenters; or if not to reconcile those to the Church who have already separated from it, which we have little hope of doing, to check the current of secession, by removing from the Prayer-book all things of a questionable character; and, whilst rejecting whatever may seem specifically *Roman*, making it more truly Catholic."

The author then asks, What is to be done?—And answers, Let a Royal Commission be appointed† for the purpose of considering how far, amongst others, the alterations, corrections, and additions herein suggested should be adopted.

"That the Sovereign should take the initiative in this matter is not to be expected. Only let a respectable majority (or any considerable number) of her subjects show, by suitable memorials and petitions, that it is their earnest wish that some such revision and remodelling of the Prayer-book, as is now suggested, should take place, and we doubt not Her Majesty would graciously and readily comply with their request."‡

* "The Commission under William III. was composed of ten bishops and twenty divines, 'men eminent for their piety and learning, whose names shine out as bright lights,' amongst them being Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Burnet, &c. By them was proposed a thorough Revision in a Protestant sense, which would (it was expected) have brought into the Church at least two-thirds of those who had been driven out by the Act of Uniformity. This Prayer-book thus happily revised was approved by the king, but as a large number of the High Church clergy were against it, it was never proposed to Convocation."—"Who shall Revise the Book of Common Prayer?" By the Rev. B. W. SAVILE, M.A., p. 38. Longmans, 1877.

† Of the Commission of 1867-70 we have already spoken more than once, and need not repeat our opinion of it here. See Appendix, Vol. I., pp. 426-7.

‡ Introduction to Prayer-book Remodelled, p. 17.

We will now proceed to examine in detail the different sections into which the tract is divided, requesting our readers to accompany our observations with “the Prayer-book Remodelled” in their hand.

I.—OF THE TABLES, AND LESSONS PROPER FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS.

We think that, though in some respects the table here suggested is an improvement on the existing one, there is much room left for amendment. We think, for example, a far greater *option* of chapters should be allowed than is here given, and that *parts* of chapters would be often advantageously substituted for whole ones;* and far more might be left, than is here done, to the discretion of the clergy.

II.—THE ORDER OF MORNING PRAYER.

The rubric, which suggests liberty to *commence by singing*,† we highly approve; as also the enlargement of the Introductory Sentences, so as to suit a *greater variety of occasions* than the selection now given.

Some alterations follow to which we cannot so readily assent, as being an unnecessary tampering with the present Prayer-book; a thing, in our judgment, as much as possible to be avoided. Under this head comes eminently the omission of the *Venite exultemus* in this place; though we should not object to its being occasionally used as introductory to the rest of the service. We object also to the suggested alterations in the *Te Deum*.

* Both these suggestions have been partially adopted in the New Lectionary which came into operation for the first time Jan. 1, 1872. The third suggestion would depend much on “the discretion” of the individual clergyman.

† One mode, amongst many, of varying the monotony of our present service might be by occasionally *commencing* with singing or chanting the 95th Psalm, especially on days when the Holy Communion is administered.

III.—THE LITANY.

We cannot assent to the removal of the *individual* address to each member of the Holy Trinity. We think the alteration uncalled for, and likely to give offence.* We also think this service ought *never* to be used in conjunction with both the Morning Prayer and the Communion Office. No better mode of shortening the too lengthy Morning Service occurs to us than the use of the Litany as a distinct Service,† or alternately with the Pre-Communion.

IV.—THE EVENING PRAYER.

While entirely approving of the principle of introducing a third service into the Book of Common Prayer, we think this might have been accomplished in a manner more in accordance with the general spirit of the Prayer-book, than is here shown; for this purpose an appropriate addition to the Calendar of Lessons, and a *division of the Psalms into three*—instead of two—*portions for the day*, would be highly expedient.

V.—PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS FOR PARTICULAR OCCASIONS.

Several verbal amendments in these, with some additions and omissions, occur to us which are not noticed by our author. For example, we think that a simple Collect for the Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth might be substituted for the longer form, when required at the time of Morning Service.

VI.—The omission of the Lord's Prayer at the com-

* The same may be said of the objection taken by some revisors to the expression "miserable sinners," which, when chanted, sounds certainly ridiculous enough.

† At the Chapel Royal, St. James's, whenever the Holy Communion is celebrated, the Mid-day Service commences with the Litany, Morning Prayer having been said at the early Service. This could not be conveniently done in the country; but the Litany should in this case always be omitted.

mencement of the Communion Office we think an improvement; as also its omission in the Litany, whenever that service is read in conjunction with Morning Prayer.

The total omission of the Athanasian Creed, as is done in the American Prayer-book, recommends itself to our judgment,* if it be a thing impossible (as some aver) to do away with its damnatory clauses,† while retaining the main body of the creed. We are of opinion that religion suffers more by the retention, than it would by the removal, of this much-misapprehended (and with respect to the Eastern Church, most uncharitable) creed.‡

* On December 12th, 1872, the Deans of Canterbury (R. P. Smith) and Chester (J. S. Howson) presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury a Memorial in regard to the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed in its present form. To the Memorial were appended signatures of nearly 3,000 clergymen, including 14 deans, 25 archdeacons, 190 cathedral dignitaries, 7 Cambridge professors, 81 masters and fellows of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, 5 principals of theological colleges, 70 head masters of public schools, and 180 clergy of the metropolis. The Dean of Canterbury, in supporting the prayer of the Memorial, stated that while two methods were suggested in which relief could be given, either one of which would satisfy the majority, their scruples would not be removed by any explanation which could be given in a note, nor by the recitation of the Creed being confined to Trinity Sunday.

† It is inconceivable the amount of injury that is done to the Church by the obstinate retention of these clauses. Witness the following from a poem quoted p. 192 :

“Do you never hear
Pronounced unmincingly the sure damnation
Of every soul who shall not learnedly steer
His heavenward course by compass Athanasian?
Yes! and sad wonder, mixed with sacred fear,
Pervades our soul on every such occasion,
When earth-worms dare th’ audacious profanation.”
Ravencross ; a Poem. (W. J. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street.)

‡ A resolution (we are told) was carried in the Irish Church Synod on May 5th, 1876, by an overwhelming majority, both of clergy and laity, to omit the rubric passed last year from before the Athanasian Creed. The effect of this will be to exclude the Creed from the public services.

See Vol. I., Letter XXII., p. 155; Vol. II., Letter LXXV., p. 30. The

VII.—In the selection of the Epistles and Gospels more might be done in the way of improvement than is here suggested, especially about the period of Easter, when abridgment is imperatively needed.

VIII.—THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

There is much change here introduced that we cannot endorse; some of the suggestions, on the other hand, we think a decided improvement. We disapprove of the alteration of the *form* of administering the bread and wine—the only amendment on the present use which we could wish, being, that the minister should be at liberty to address the *whole rail collectively* in the first part of the sentence, thus: “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for *you*, preserve your *bodies* and *souls* unto everlasting life;”—and then, proceeding to deliver the elements to each communicant severally, to add—“Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died *for thee*, and feed on Him in *thy* heart by faith with thanksgiving”—and so with the cup, until a new rail is filled; the same process being repeated *toties quoties*. This would greatly relieve the officiating clergyman when there are many communicants; and the effect (as proved by experiment) would be found to be equally impressive with the present form, if not more so.

We object to the compulsory Rubric, that in parishes of more than five hundred inhabitants the celebration of the Lord's Supper should be once a month. It holds true

following, from Newman's *Arians*, is worthy of attentive consideration:—
 “If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the Primitive Church, it is not for any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult as in a virtue; but because *technicality and formality* are inevitable results of public confessions of faith.”

of solemn acts of devotion, as of most other things, that too frequent repetition destroys much of their effect.*

IX.—THE PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

In this service (as well as in that of Private, and Adult, Baptism) considerable alteration is made by our author. The subject is one of that delicacy, that it is impossible to enter upon it in a sketch like the present.

We may observe, however, that here again it appears to us (wholly irrespective of the regeneration difficulty) that an unnecessary amount of violence is done to the prejudices of people who have been so long accustomed to the existing forms.†

The substitution of two for three sponsors we think an improvement, as also (the 29th canon notwithstanding) the permission for parents to answer for their own children. The expression “place him under the banner of the cross,” does not recommend itself to our judgment. The omission of the following paragraph we should be willing to concede to the scruples of those who take umbrage at it, if the grand difficulty connected with these services could be thus easily disposed of.‡

* The Bishop of Oxford, in his Charge of Nov., 1860, p. 12, seems to infer that increased *numbers* of communicants *necessarily* indicate increased seriousness. In this matter people must be allowed to judge according to their own ideas, which will still differ with the individual constitution.

† The opponents of the undoubted view of our Church, from the time of Cranmer to the present, on the question of baptismal regeneration, do not appear sufficiently to consider *the immense amount of authority* by which such view is supported. Jewel, Hooker, Bishop Hall, Taylor, Barrow, Beveridge, Mede, Andrews, Ken, Pearson, Usher, Wall, Waterland, Horne, Heber, and many more of almost equal celebrity, have in various ways expressed their acceptance of the doctrine.

‡ It is not by the alteration of a *single sentence* that this Gordian knot can be untied. Every attempt that we have seen to get rid of the difficulty has appeared to ourselves more or less a failure; the simple fact being that

X.—The author's Catechism we can by no means accept. We think it decidedly the worst feature in his idea of a remodelled Prayer-book. Right or wrong, there is something in the existing Catechism so engrafted on our earliest associations, that we are persuaded an enormous amount of resistance would be made by the members of the Church to any attempt at introducing, as is here done, a totally new one in its place. At the same time we think that the expression "*verily and indeed*,"* in the second part, would be well exchanged for "*spiritually*" (as in the Communion office);—beyond that, we see very little that requires alteration in this simple exposition of our faith, while there is much, very much, in it that we greatly approve and admire.

XI.—THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION.

While there are parts in this Service, as given in our Prayer-book, manifestly open to objection, and easily capable of improvement, we do not think this the most successful chapter of "The Prayer-book Remodelled."

With three or four hundred candidates for confirmation, at one gathering, the Bishop would find it no easy task to put to *each* the question here suggested. To limit the age, and define *the condition* before being confirmed (as is done by our author in his final rubric), would, we fear, reduce by three-fourths the present number, already too few, of those offering for the rite, however *desirable* it may be in theory that all persons who are confirmed should thenceforth become regular communicants.

a *new birth* in baptism is the doctrine of our Church, as clearly shewn by Mr. Fisher himself in his "Liturgical Purity," and cannot be got rid of consistently with the profession of *Church membership*.

* "This clause was introduced into the Catechism in James I.'s reign (1604) by the king's order, and without the authority of Parliament, and is now expunged from the Revised Prayer-book of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America."—B. W. SAVILE, p. 35. Longmans, 1877.

XII.—THE SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY.

Great improvement is here made on the present service, though again we have to complain of the text being, in some instances, *needlessly* tampered with. For example, why alter the expressions now put into the mouths of M. and N.?—What is gained by the alteration?—The removal of the *subsequent* clause, “With my body I thee worship, with all my worldly goods I thee endow,” we as entirely approve, as we resist what in the other case appears a mere changing for changing’s sake. We need hardly say that we agree in the expediency of releasing the company without inflicting upon them the concluding homily.

XIII.—PRAYERS FOR THE SICK.

The rubric giving liberty to the minister to use on these occasions such prayers as he may think fit, seems almost superfluous. We conceive the instances are few indeed in which any one considers himself bound here by the letter of the Prayer-book.

The *absolution* is altogether omitted. It would have been as well if *a form* had been retained, under the supposition of sincere penitence on the part of the sick person; the form in the Communion Service appears to be unexceptionable for the purpose. It is to be regretted, also, that attention is not here called to more passages in Scripture peculiarly adapted to the occasion.

XIV.—THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

We do not approve of the suggested return into the church *after* the body has been committed to the ground. We are persuaded it would not be generally acceptable. But we think a *general discretion* might be given to the minister, wider than appears in the present rubric, to *limit*

his ministrations, on occasion, to those parts which are said on entering the churchyard and at the grave.

Our author omits "the sure and certain hope" in *all* cases. We rather think that an *alternative* form, *not expressive of doubt*, but *simply of charity*,* should be supplied, to meet those painful cases which from time to time occur to make the use of *but one form* a solemn mockery in the ears of the bystanders who were conversant with the habits of the deceased.† The omission of the words "ashes to ashes" is another instance of that *needless* tampering with the existing text, of which we have so often had to complain.

* Such an alternative form, if *used discreetly* and with sufficient reverence, would rarely, if ever, give offence to the survivors. The late Bishop of Calcutta (Cotton), in his Charge of October, 1863, suggests a short service for non-communicants.

"As the law now stands, parochial clergymen and cemetery chaplains are required to read the service over all the dead brought to them for interment, with the exception of 'persons unbaptised, sane suicides, and persons formally excommunicated.' They must read it, therefore, over the body of a man fallen in a duel, who staggered into the presence of his Maker loaded with the double guilt of suicide and intended murder—over a man killed in a prize fight, who gambled away his life for the chance of winning a stake of £5, £10, or £100—over men killed in drunken brawls—over women of the town, who have been supported to the day of their death on the wages of prostitution—over men and women who have lived and died in adultery, or in unmarried concubinage—over notorious blasphemers, drunkards, and Sabbath-breakers. They may also be required to read the Burial Service over every kind of believer, or misbeliever, or unbeliever—over heretics, schismatics, and infidels—over a Popish priest and a Socinian minister—over those who believe too much, and those who believe too little—the credulous pervert, the sneering sceptic, the bold assulant of the genuineness and veracity of the inspired records."—SIR HENRY THOMSON, *Frant*.

† On this subject the Rev. Dr. Blackwood (in a speech delivered at the Prayer-book Revision Association Annual Meeting, 1867,) quotes the following:—

"But when the Prayer-book's prostituted strain,
From priestly lips, the evil and the good
Alike doth canonize; making death gain,
Though Christ was not the life. When liver lewd,
Sot, fool, knave, wh-e, the vicious and the vain,
Have God thanked for their deaths in solemn mood,
The blasphemous mockery chills or fires the blood.

XV.—THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

This is the grand feature of the book before us.

The articles are reduced *from thirty-nine* to twenty*, as was done by the American Church in 1785,† when other alterations were made in their Liturgy.

To enter upon the twenty Articles severally is of course impossible. But we hesitate not to say that the author deserves thanks for this fearless exposition of what in his judgment is sufficient to constitute the basis of a comprehensive National Church. ‡

"It fires the blood with righteous indignation,
Or chills it into deadly unbelief ;

* * * * *

"It shocks all reason—hence the sceptic jeers
Successfully at priests and priestcraft ; then
'Gainst Truth herself boldly he whets sharp sneers—
Seeing the Church at death so daub the vilest men."

Ravencross ; a Poem. (W. J. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street, E.C. 1867.)

* The Rev. J. H. Newman, in a letter to the *Globe*, dated Birmingham, June 28, 1862, says, "The thought of the Anglican Service makes me shiver, and *the thought of the Thirty-nine Articles makes me shudder.*"

† See Life of Calamy, vol. ii., p. 336.

‡ The Author is happy in finding the above remark fully confirmed by the following from the lips of the learned and intelligent Bishop Fraser, of Manchester, as addressed to the Working Men of Sheffield at the late Church Congress, October 3, 1878, and received *with applause*, and (as far as appears from the Report of the speech) eliciting not one single dissentient voice:—

"There are those who say that there are something like 700 theological propositions in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England ; and I suppose there are a great many more than 700 theological propositions in the Westminster Confession ; and certainly there are in the dogmatic statements of other religious communities. When my Bible tells me that Christ came to make a simple way to heaven, in which a wayfaring man, though a fool, should not err ; when we are told that He came to preach the Gospel to the poor, and that the common people heard Him gladly ; when we read the practical utterances preserved in the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of St. Matthew, or even the deeper and mysterious utterances in the Upper Chamber of Jerusalem, will any one attempt to persuade me that it is necessary for any man, for the life of his soul, to subscribe to 700 theological propositions ? When men have lost all sense of proportion, sometimes that which is minutest and least important is made more of than the principle that

His concluding rubric runs as follows :—

“These Articles shall be subscribed by every candidate for Holy Orders, and by every minister about to be presented to any benefice, in the form following :—

*“I, A. B., do sincerely and heartily subscribe to the above twenty articles, understood in their natural grammatical sense, without any prevarication or mental reservation.”**

This brings us to the end of “The Prayer-book Remodelled.” An Appendix is subjoined, containing a vindication of the various alterations, omissions, and additions to which we have alluded, and other matters which our limits prevented our noticing as we passed along.

We do not expect this attempt to be generally acceptable to the public. The author himself does not anticipate so favourable a reception of his labours. But the more it is studied, the more generally will it be approved ; and a careful perusal of its contents can hardly fail to satisfy every reasonable mind how far from perfect is the Book of Common Prayer as we now have it. Many will see, from our author’s pages, how much room there is for amendment, how much in the Prayer-book that is justly demurred to ; how very far the volume is from being what Englishmen have a

covers and embraces all. When Paul would tell me what is the gospel I ought to preach if I would be a follower of him, he speaks of the fundamental principle of repentance towards God and faith towards Christ—matters about which no living Christian men have two opinions ; and we ought to labour to bring men back to the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus, and to the rudimentary truths which all acknowledge, though they do not obey them.”

(ADDRESSES, &c. Thomas Widdison, Sheffield, 1878.)

* Sir Matthew Hale resisted the proposal that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles should be a necessary qualification for holding office in *Church or State*. (*Parl. Hist.*, vol. iv., p. 79.) The Articles have been somewhat irreverently, but not altogether unreasonably, designated the “forty stripes save one.” The Rev. Mr. Voysey applied to them these bitter words, “Whosoever shall fall on that stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall it shall grind him to powder.” (*Unorthodox London*, p. 47.)

right to expect at this advanced period of the history of the Church.

They will see, we would further believe, an ample apology for those who have for years been engaged in the thankless task of opening the eyes of the public—too long accustomed to acquiesce in things as they are, *because they are*—to the moral guilt they are incurring in allowing *the present imperfect book* to be circulated yearly by millions of copies in all languages, when it is capable of so much improvement, and contains so much that is reasonably excepted against.

They will see also—let the author of these Letters be permitted to hope in conclusion—the best possible defence for the prominent part we have ourselves taken, and which we still purpose to take, in bringing every aid and appliance we possess to bear upon the prosecution of this good work ;—namely, the obtaining legal sanction to such alterations in the Book of Common Prayer as shall make it (as far as lies within the skill and judgment of man) a perfect manual of devotion for a truly National Church.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Dec. 14, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CIV.

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING A REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK, AND A REVIEW OF THE ACTS OF UNIFORMITY.*

“Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo.”—VIRGIL.

“If bishops our just desires deny,
The power of bishops shall dissent supply.”

DRYDEN (Travesty).

SIR,—Two meetings, partaking more or less of a public character, were last week held in London on the subject of

* Offices, 17, Buckingham Street, Adelphi, W.C. President, Lord Ebury.

Revision, which has now taken its legitimate place amongst the questions of the day. Having been present on each occasion, I think it will interest our friends, scattered throughout the kingdom, to receive through your favour a short account of the proceedings, as marking the clear progress our cause is making, notwithstanding all the difficulties it has had to encounter.

The first gathering was at the rooms of the Association for Promoting a *Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*, which, it is worthy of observation, was up to the present date the title and sole aim of that body. The chair was taken by Lord Ebury, who had been recently elected President, supported by the Dean of Manchester (Bowers) as Vice-President, and several members of the Council. The attendance of ordinary members was more numerous than on any former occasion, it being understood that a grave question affecting the future of the Association was to be brought forward. A report of the last year's proceedings was read, adopted, and ordered to be printed, together with a list of the members, the accounts were audited, and a fair balance carried forward to the ensuing year.

This routine business over, the great matter of the day was opened, and argued with good temper, but considerable earnestness, by those who took different views of the policy of the step proposed, which was the *extension of the Society's aim in its proceedings, and a consequent alteration in its title*. Hitherto the Association, through the noble lord as the exponent of its views in Parliament, had confined itself to a simple demand for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Prayer-book,* leaving it to the Commissioners to recommend, for the adoption of the Legislature, such alterations as they might agree upon in their report. This comparatively mild

* See Notes to Letter ciii., p. 184.

proposition having, however, been twice rejected in the House of Lords, at the interval of two years, owing to the determined hostility of the right reverend prelates, more particularly the Bishop of Oxford, it appeared useless to pursue the same course any longer, and a proposition was accordingly made, and seconded, to extend the basis of the Society's operations by embracing for the future the repeal or modification of the severe Act of 1662, known by the name of the Act of Uniformity.

This proposition led to much discussion, as involving a new and material feature in the Revision movement.

On the one hand, it was argued that the minor demand having been twice rejected, it was vain to repeat it;—that new friends would be conciliated by the bolder front shown by the Association;—that the public would recognise, when pointed out, the grievance of the present form of subscription* required of those entering holy orders;—and that the Bishops could no longer oppose the motion *en masse*, as they had hitherto done, inasmuch as some of their number had publicly designated the Act of 1662 as unjust and oppressive. Other lesser arguments were used on this side of the question, but these were the chief that were insisted on.

On the other hand, it was represented that this step was a passing the Rubicon;—it was what had never been contemplated by those who originally joined the Association;—it was mixing up two things which had no necessary connexion;—that the Revision of the Prayer-book was one thing, the Repeal of the Act of Uniformity was another;—that assuming the latter granted, the former would still have to be done, and that it was better not to aim at too much at once;—that the startling character of the proposed measure would alarm

* This point, as already stated, has been partially yielded, by modifying the terms of subscription for the future. (1878.)

more than it would conciliate,* and would array against *all* Revision an amount of opposition it had not as yet experienced.

The speakers on either side having been heard with great patience, and an evident desire to learn all that could be alleged *pro* and *con.*, the proposition was put from the chair, and carried by a decided majority, that the wider basis should henceforth be the rule of the Association, and its title altered accordingly. The minority, for the sake of peace, acquiesced in the decision, and harmony prevailed to the end of the meeting.

En avant has now, therefore, become the watch-word of the Revisionists; and if the result of this new phasis in its operations be a more serious disturbance of the *status* of the Church than was originally contemplated by the movers in this matter, the sin (if any) clearly lies at the door of those who for upwards of two years have pertinaciously resisted the most moderate attempts at an improvement of the Prayer-book.

The Bishop of Oxford, with his cry of "*Resist innocent alterations by all means,*"† has succeeded in provoking a combination of forces which he will find too strong for him in the long run, and which some of the warmest friends of Revision not only never contemplated, but even deprecated from the beginning.‡ This is what it is to be too wise. We are going to have a re-enactment, on a smaller scale, of the Reform Bill warfare of 1830-32, simply because certain anti-reforming prelates cannot take a lesson of experience from the past.

* As it eventually did; and as was earnestly represented at the time (though without success) by the Author of these Letters.

† See before, Letter ci., p. 173.

‡ The Author was one of the number, and was supported in that view by the late Deans of Manchester and Norwich (Bowers and Pellew), and the present Bishop of Montreal (Ashton Oxenden).

I must now conclude, reserving the proceedings of the second meeting to my next; and remain, meanwhile,

Yours, &c.,

Dec. 17, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CV.

THE DOCTRINAL REVISIONISTS.

“Have all, tyne all.”—*Scotch Proverb.*

SIR,—The second meeting of the Revisionists, to which I referred in my last, was held shortly after the former one in the large room of the Caledonian Hotel, Adelphi, the chair being taken by Mr. R. Baxter, of Queen’s Square, Westminster, supported by Messrs. Gell, Dayman, Carr Glyn, and other of the Derbyshire petitioners,* or those generally favourable to the views of that section of the movement.

All the speakers, with one exception, advocated doctrinal Revision, dwelling chiefly upon what may now be designated as the *five points* of the Revisionists’ charter :—

I.—The removal of the words “whosoever sins thou dost remit, &c.,” from the Ordination Service.

II.—A corresponding alteration in the form of Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick.

III.—The removal of the Athanasian Creed.†

IV.—A modification of the Burial Service.

V.—A Revision of the Baptismal Services, the Catechism, and Confirmation Service.

* See before, Letter LXXX., p. 57.

† Of this creed Bishop Jeremy Taylor observes, “Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly, unless the article of the Trinity be believed as it is there with euriosity and minute particulars explained.”—*Liberty of Prophecy*, § ii., chap. 36. See Letter LXXV., p. 30.

Other matters were introduced into the discussion,—such as the disuse of the Apocrypha, enlargement of the Calendar, separation or abridgment of the Services, modification or alteration of the Rubric, and the like,—but it was clear from the tone of the speakers that their heart was set upon obtaining what they call *relief for tender consciences* upon the five points above enumerated, especially the fifth, without which they seemed comparatively indifferent as to the success or failure of the present agitation.

The one exceptional speaker to whom we have alluded,* (and who had been present at the Piccadilly meeting, which most of the others had not,) represented with much earnestness the danger incurred of losing everything by aiming at too much at once, illustrating his argument by the well-known fable of the boy with his hand in the jar of raisins. He dwelt upon the extreme difficulty that was experienced in getting any, even the smallest measure of Church reform, the hostile front presented by almost the united hierarchy,—the opposition of the 10,000,—the failure of the Commission of 1689 from this very cause,—the known aversion of the entire High Church party, and even of moderate Churchmen, to any tampering with the Baptismal Services;—while, upon the abridgment question, the Calendar, the Rubric, and some other minor points, there was a very general agreement.

His plea, however, was met by a cry similar to that of “Great is Diana of the Ephesians,” and it was all but unanimously resolved to *go forward* at all hazards, hoisting the banner of the above-mentioned five points as the rallying point of the party.

In the course of the debate much stress was laid on the recent Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol

* The Author of the “Ingoldsby Letters.”

(Baring),* from which large extracts were read with applause, and it was urged, not without show of reason, by one speaker in particular, that it would be a standing reproach to the advocates for Revision if they now held back when thus countenanced by one of the Right Reverend Prelates.

What has been stated in the present, as well as my former letter, is of course but a very brief outline of what took place on this occasion ; but two things may be gathered from it, and they are significant :—

1. That the two sections of Revisionists were up to this time distinct, and had little or no connexion with one another.

2. That they are now fast approximating to a union—the decision of the former meeting having been to embrace a Repeal of the Act of Uniformity within the scope of its operations,—that of the latter, to be satisfied with nothing less than carrying one and all of the *five points* upon which the greatest difference of opinion is known to exist both within and without the pale of the Establishment.

Whether the hierarchy have acted wisely or not in provoking this union of forces, remains to be seen. We have ourselves always held that a timely and reasonable concession was preferable to a prolonged resistance. The Bishop of Oxford thinks differently ; and he appears to have sufficient weight with his brethren to have brought a majority of them to be of the same opinion.

One other thing may be gathered from the proceedings I have attempted to detail—and that is, that it will be impossible for the Bishops any longer to ignore the existence of this movement, or to treat it (as the irrepressible Arch-deacon of Taunton would do) with contempt. They must make up their minds to one of two courses,—either, by

* See Letters xcvin., xcix., pp. 158—166.

continued opposition, to provoke a more extended agitation on the part of the Revisionists,—or, which is more probable, because the more rational course, agree amongst themselves as to the extent to which they will consent that Revision shall be carried, and so at least succeed in dividing the forces of the enemy, and in all probability thus stave off a greater measure of Reform for the term of their episcopacy.*

Trusting that they may be endowed with wisdom from above to adopt this latter course,

I remain, yours, &c.,

Dec. 23, 1860.

“INGOLDSBY.”

P.S.—Within two years after the above was written the two sections of Revisionists, as might have been anticipated from the continued opposition of the hierarchy, coalesced, and are now organised as one body. Their programme of things demanded (as issued at their last General Meeting) is as follows :—

I.—With respect to the ACT OF UNIFORMITY,—such an alteration of the terms of subscription as will no longer compel clergymen and graduates to declare their approbation of every line and letter in the Prayer-book.

II.—With respect to the DAILY AND OCCASIONAL SERVICES,—

1. The substitution in the *Service for Ordering Priests* of a precatory form for the words, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., and the removal of the clause, “Whose soever sins thou dost forgive,” &c. These words formed no part of the Ordinals of the Western Church for at least the first thousand years of the Christian era, and at this moment are not found in the Rituals of the Greek and Eastern Churches.

2. Such a modification of the *Baptismal Services* as will relieve the minister from the necessity of asserting that the baptized person is thereby regenerate, with such verbal alterations in the *Catechism and Order of Confirmation* as will bring these formularies into more complete harmony with the freedom of opinion which has been legally

* See Letter of Lord Goderich to the Bishop of Llandaff, p. 171. Something like the course suggested in the text was adopted by the late amiable Archbishop of Canterbury (Longley), and not without partial success.

declared permissible within the Established Church. Also the optional use of vicarious stipulations on behalf of children to be baptized, with permission to parents to undertake all needful responsibilities for their own children.

3. The form of Absolution in the *Service for the Visitation of the Sick* to be assimilated to the declaration of pardon in the Morning and Evening Prayer, or to the form of Absolution in the Communion Service.

4. Such amendments in the *Burial Service* as may render it more universally appropriate.

5. The optional use of the *Athanasian Creed*, with or without the damnatory clauses. Also the power of omitting a part or the whole of the *Communion Service*, and of abbreviating the *Service for the Solemnization of Matrimony*.

6. The separation of Services originally distinct, so as to detach the Litany and Communion Service from being of necessity part and parcel of the Morning Prayer on Sundays and other holy-days; as well as permission to the Minister to make use of certain portions of the Prayer-book for Afternoon or Evening Service on Sundays, when both are held in the same church, and for any extra week-day Service.

7. The restoration to the minister of the *discretionary power he once possessed* of occasionally substituting for the appointed Lessons others which he may consider more appropriate.

An Association has also been formed at Bristol, having similar objects in view, as will be seen by the following suggestions recently issued by that body:—

1. The suppression or modification of all such orders and rubrics as are no longer generally observed or enforced.

2. The change of some *unusual and obsolete words* for the language of the present day.

3. The Revision of the *Calendar*, by the exclusion of the *Apocryphal Lessons*, the addition of the Book of Revelation, the re-arrangement of the Old Testament Lessons, &c.

4. In the *Service for Ordering Priests*, the substitution of a more clearly precatory form for the words "Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.," and the omission of the clause, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, &c."

5. In the *Baptismal Services*, the omission of the statement that the baptized person is regenerate; with such alterations in the *Catechism* and *Order of Confirmation* as will harmonize with the proposed change:—also the optional use of vicarious engagements on behalf of children to be baptized, with permission to parents to undertake responsibility for their own children.

6. In the *Daily Services*, power to be given to the minister to separate those Services which were originally distinct; namely, the Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion Service, provided that, on every Sunday, the whole of the now appointed Morning and Evening Services be used in the same Church during some portion of the day; also, at any other than the regular Morning and Evening Services, to select such portions of Holy Scripture, for Lessons, as he may consider appropriate.

7. In the form of *Solemnization of Matrimony*, either some modification, or the liberty to abbreviate.

8. In the Service for the *Visitation of the Sick*, the form of Absolution to be assimilated to that used in the Morning and Evening Prayer, or to that in the Communion Service.

9. In the *Burial Service*, such amendments as may render it more universally appropriate.

10. The Revision of the *Communion Service*.

11. The optional use of the *Athanasian Creed*.

LETTER CVI.

CHARGE OF THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S (THIRLWALL), 1860.

"But, soft, behold! lo, where it comes again!

I'll cross it, though it blast me."—HAMLET.

"The Bishop has contributed nothing to the solution of any practical difficulty. There is consummate ability shown in circumambulating the question, and avoiding its central point."—ROWLAND WILLIAMS, *Reply to Bishop Thirlwall*.

SIR,—Writhing under the lash of the Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter,* it is not surprising that Bishop Thirlwall should have sat down in no very good humour to the inditing his seventh triennial charge to his clergy.†

If the sling and the stone of the Vicar of Brodechalke,

* The Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., of "Essays and Reviews" notoriety, had not then resigned his post of Vice-Principal in the above College, in the discharge of the duties of which he had a sharp controversy with the Bishop of the diocese. He died in January, 1870.

† Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's by the Right Rev. Connop Thirlwall, at his seventh visitation. London. 1860.

ex-Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, have not succeeded in prostrating the Welsh Giant, it is clear that they have painfully galled him. Like Tydeus of old, the Wiltshire hero, though mighty in spirit, happens to be below the average of mankind in stature; the Bishop, consequently, in his frantic efforts to retaliate upon his pigmy assailant, hits over his head, and his blows fall somewhat clumsily upon the breast and shoulders of the lookers-on.

Jesting apart, it is difficult on any other supposition to account for the manifest ill-temper in which the present Charge is conceived, remarkably contrasting in this respect with that of his lordship's fellow-worker in the southern division of the Principality.*

The persons who come under the episcopal censure on this occasion are :—*Imprimis et ante omnes*, the noble lord who has had the presumption to move twice for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Prayer-book in that House which is occasionally honoured by the presence, and sometimes edified by the addresses, of the Right Rev. the Bishop of St. David's.

Descending from great things to small, the second individual who is animadverted upon by the Bishop, is the hapless Chaplain of the Stroud Union, the Rev. C. H. Davis, of Nailsworth celebrity. This gentleman has unfortunately connected himself with the noble lord, by the publication of a work, entitled "*Liturgical Revision Illustrated and Vindicated on Orthodox Principles, with an Introduction by Lord Ebury*,"† and further incurs the Bishop's displeasure from the fact that, being "a clergyman," he has ventured to "print" his thoughts!

Thirdly comes under the lash of our irate Prelate the

* See Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff at his fourth visitation, September, 1860, by Alfred Ollivant, D.D.

† See Vol. I., Letter LXVII., p. 400.

somewhat conspicuous ex-Canon of Norwich, the Rev. C. N. Wodehouse, whose sins are,—

1st. That he has dared to resign all his preferments, including a bishop's chaplaincy, on conscientious grounds.*

2nd. That he has published a letter, in which he asks, among other things, Where are the "faith, hope, and charity" of the Bishops, in refusing all relief to the tender consciences of those 4,000 clergy who memorialised the Archbishop on the hardship imposed upon them by the terms employed in the Burial Service of our Church? †

Fourthly, a severe attack is made upon the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A., some time Rural Dean and Minister of St. John's, Derby, who, being no longer under episcopal control, has not scrupled to put forth a work, entitled, "Thoughts on the Liturgy; or the Difficulties of an Honest and Conscientious Use of the Book of Common Prayer, Considered as a Loud and Reasonable Call for the only Remedy,—*Revision*." ‡

Fifthly, it was not to be expected that the learned barrister in the North, Mr. J. C. Fisher, the Coryphæus of the doctrinal revisionists, should escape. This is the arch-offender, whose "Liturgical Purity" provoked the Cambrian Prelates' wrath, both North and South, in 1857, § and whose work having since gone into a second and third edition, the original sin of the author is by consequence materially aggravated.

Sixthly, there is a word of rebuke for "the organ of the Ultramontane party in France," as quoted by Lord Ebury in the appendix to his speech; and

* See Letter LXXIII., p. 17.

† About this grievance of the Clergy there cannot be a shadow of doubt, and it is a standing reproach to the Bishops, or the Legislature, that it has not long ago been redressed. (1878.)

‡ See Letter LXXX., p. 54.

§ See Vol. I., Letter XXIII., p. 165.

Seventhly and Lastly—but here we are at fault—*Stat nominis umbra*. No one is *named* either in the episcopal text or notes, but it appears that *some* “less candid and temperate advocate of revision” than the noble lord has taken the unwarrantable liberty to make the Bishop of St. David’s himself the butt for “coarse insinuation and misplaced ridicule” (Charge, p. 46).

Happily, this individual, be he who he may, stands alone in his glory. The Bishop informs his clergy and the public that “he is not sure that there has been more than one example of this mode of conducting the controversy.”

Ridicule, his lordship might have known, is a weapon not so easily handled as to be within the power of every puny whipster. It is a two-edged sword that is not unapt to cut the fingers of the unpractised gladiator. Having such an opponent, therefore, as the historian of Greece and editor of *Sehleiermacher* to deal with, it is not surprising that, out of the many champions of Liturgical Revision, only one should have been found bold enough, or rash enough if the Bishop pleases, to venture upon caustic satire as a means to the desired end. Every age does not produce a Sydney Smith; but even a portion of the spirit of that remarkable man may do something towards exposing the shallow arguments and untenable position of the opponents of Revision.

But the Bishop is mistaken (owing, we presume, to “the overwhelming pressure of episcopal cares”)* in assuming that this offensive mode of conducting the controversy *is* confined to *one* individual. To our own knowledge *three* writers at least have brought the swift-winged arrows of wit to bear with great point upon this question; and we are inclined to think that we owe to this fact, more than any other, the evident soreness with which the present Charge is

* See Rowland Williams’ Critical Appendix, p. 23.

written, as well as the tone in which the Bishop of Oxford addressed the House of Lords on a late occasion.* “Nettled and stung by pismires,” the two Right Rev. Prelates feel their dignity assailed, and cloak their personal mortification under a seeming zeal for the integrity of the Church.

We have not much inclination, neither do we suppose have our readers, to follow the Bishop of St. David’s through the forty pages of his Charge devoted to the Revision question. We rather marvel at the patience of the Welsh clergy, generally thought to be somewhat hot-headed, who could sit it out; still more are we amazed that any of them should have “requested its publication.”

One misstatement, however, we think it important to notice. The Athanasian Creed, on the most favourable supposition,† does not date earlier than the *fifth* or *seventh* century, whereas it is here reckoned as of co-authority with the Nicene. At the same time the Bishop’s defence of this Creed‡ and the

* See Letter xcvi., p. 151.

† Dr. Cave observes of this Creed that it obtained not in the Churches before the year 1000; nor became to be famous everywhere till the year 1233. Father Montfaucon says it was not taken notice of or received before the year 670 or 673, while Dr. Waterland conjectures that it was in all probability composed between the years 426 and 430, and received in the Gallican Church as early as 670.—*Life of Chillingworth*, p. 80.

“The creed was certainly not composed by Athanasius (says Dr. Hook), nor can it be attributed to *any* author. It is unfortunate, indeed, that the name of St. Athanasius has been attached to it. Bishop Thirlwall, in his Charge of 1872, p. 39, says, “According to the earliest date than can with any probability be assigned to its authorship, it was the product of a very evil and unhappy time, . . . a period marked by a rapid decline of spiritual life in the Church.”—*Sermon by Rev. W. Milton*; Sheffield. 1873.

“The recitation of a Creed so intolerant is contrary to the right spirit of public worship, as being destructive of that calm and reverent frame of mind in which men ought to approach God.”—*Dr. Payne Smith; Ritual Report*, p. xx. This deponent sayeth true.

‡ A correspondent of the *Cambridge Independent Press*, Oct., 1862, writes:—“The friends of Church reform and Liturgical revision will be surprised to know that they have reason for expecting sympathy in one direction

power of priestly absolution, will probably not a little surprise some of his college contemporaries who have not forgotten the correspondence which passed between him and the late Dr. Wordsworth of Trinity, on the question of the admission of Dissenters to the University.

Nous avons changé tout cela. Bishop Thirlwall is by no means singular in exhibiting the metamorphosis produced by donning the episcopal purple. There is another college in Cambridge, to say nothing of the sister university,* which has afforded of late a memorable instance of the power of the lawn. Humble Incumbents who fought the battle of the Church, to their own damage,† some twenty years ago against the attempted innovations of those in power, stand aghast at reading articles in the *Times* commending the *orthodoxy* of a certain occupant of the Episcopal Bench,‡ who was prevented only by the interference of the Visitor from striking a blow at the Church in the University, unparalleled since the days of James the Second.

Well, so be it, since Prime Ministers will have it so. But we are greatly mistaken if the highest order in the Church

of their efforts from the new Archbishop of Canterbury. Several years ago Dr. Longley's sister married a gentleman who was a Dissenter, and of a heterodox sect. A correspondence, which was afterwards published under the title of 'The Brothers' Controversy,' ensued between the brothers-in-law, in the course of which the present Archbishop of Canterbury observes, 'Nothing that I have advanced on the subject of the Athanasian Creed is, as I conceive, in the least degree inconsistent with my joining in the sentiment of Tillotson, and wishing it removed from our Church Service. If I were called upon to give my vote upon the subject, it would be for its omission.' It is true Dr. Longley at that time was only a simple clergyman, but it is possible he may not even now shrink from the avowal" (and I believe he did not).—See also letter from Tillotson to Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, Oct. 23, 1694; in *Life of the latter*, vol. vi., p. 326.

* See Vol. I., Letter LIII., p. 335.

† The Incumbent of Ingoldsby, author of these "Letters," to wit.

‡ Dr. Graham, some time Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, Chaplain to Prince Albert, and subsequently Bishop of Chester, 1848-65.

gains in public opinion by such gross instances of tergiversation. We do not protest against all change of opinion either in politics or theology—quite the reverse—men get wiser as they get older. But we think it deeply to be deplored when such change is concurrent with the worldly interest of the individual, whether in Church* or State; and we cannot therefore attach the slightest value to any *δεύτεραι φροντίδες* thus tardily and equivocally arrived at. Meanwhile the great question of Revision is left by Bishop Thirlwall in this Charge much as he found it; not an argument being adduced against the measure which has not been satisfactorily refuted a hundred times.

The short reference made to Archbishop Whately's recent Charge is sufficiently amusing, when we consider how entirely that learned Prelate's arguments *in favour of Revision* are passed over in silence. The appeal to Convocation would also raise a smile, if the subject were not too painful a one. Hard would be the case of the advocates for Revision if they were driven into that port as their only resource. Convocation † has not the power (and we very much doubt of its will) to do anything of the kind desired. He, therefore, who, like the Bishop, would still dance attendance upon that anomalous body, may well be compared to him who, in his simplicity,

“ Waits till the river pass away—but lo!
Ceaseless it flows, and will for ever flow.”

I remain, yours, &c.,

Dec. 27, 1860.

“ INGOLDSBY.”

* Lord Shaftesbury (who bore the title of “Bishop-maker” *sub rege* Palmerston) said in the House of Lords, that “experience had taught him to trust no one after he became a Bishop.” (1878.)

† Archdeacon Denison observes of this body: “In 1852 the doors of Convocation were opened, and Churchmen might *meet* and *talk* once more in the Constitutional Synod; but as for *doing*, it was never meant that they should *do* anything for the Church, and *never will be*.”—*Notes of my Life*, chap. iv., p. 65.

LETTER CVII.

RETROSPECT OF REVISION FOR THE YEAR 1860.

“Should I all recount, the day would fail,
Unequal to the melancholy tale.”—POPE.

SIR,—Another year, alas! has rolled over our heads since we commenced this Liturgical warfare, but it has been neither an uneventful, nor an unprofitable one, to the cause we have espoused.

We shall again, therefore, take stock at this season, as we did at the close of 1859,* and furnish our readers with a brief analysis of the leading features of the past twelve months, so far as the Revision question is concerned; begging them to notice how we have been steadily, though it may be slowly, going on the while from “strength to strength,”—inasmuch as 1860 is a decided advance in this respect on 1859, as that year was on 1858, and it again on 1857,—when the present struggle began.

The clerical year opened (as usual of late) with the gathering of Convocation, which, though continuing its session longer than ordinary, nevertheless contributed nothing towards the solution of the Revision difficulty. This was the more to be deplored, inasmuch as the Dean of Norwich, the Hon. and Rev. George Pellew, had a notice on the boards connected with the subject; which was, however, *designedly* thrust aside from day to day to make way for matters comparatively insignificant.†

* See Letter LXX., p. 1, “Retrospect of Revision for the year 1859.”

† The Dean succeeded at last in bringing forward his motion in the Session of 1861, but (as might have been anticipated from the constitution of Convocation) without success. See remark at the close of last Letter.

About the same time the Church was startled by the resignation of all his preferments by the Rev. C. N. Wodehouse, of Norwich,*—comprising a canonry, a valuable living, and chaplaincy to a Bishop,—the alleged ground of his resignation being that he felt he could no longer conscientiously hold his present position consistently with a presumed “assent and consent to all and everything in the Prayer-book.”

Some surprise was expressed that no public notice was taken of this step by the Bishop of the Diocese (Pelham). Either the Canon was right, or he was wrong. If wrong, an authoritative exposition of the error under which he laboured might have done much to allay the uneasiness of others similarly situated.† If right, an admirable opportunity offered, upon Lord Ebury’s renewing his motion the following May, for the Bishops as a body to admit that the whole question was deserving of serious consideration, and should receive it at their hands.

The resignation of the Canon was followed (as if in mockery of his “scruples”) by the publication of a Manifesto, from a large number of the clergy, to the effect that “any attempt at the present time to alter the Book of Common Prayer, would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church.”‡

This document received ultimately 9,925 signatures, but has been popularly called “the Declaration of the Ten Thousand;” on the same principle as “the Millenary Petitioners” under James I. received *their* title, though it is believed their numbers did not much exceed 600. But granting “the Ten Thousand” the full benefit of the fraction, they will in vain attempt to represent their numbers as

* See Letter LXXIII., p. 17; and Letter cvl., p. 205.

† See the case of the Rev. R. P. Cornish, Letter LXXIII., p. 22.

‡ See Letter LXXXII., p. 67, “Advance of the Ten Thousand.”

even *half* that of the clergy of the United Church, much less as that "*vast majority*" they have been styled by the Bishop of Oxford, who is rather apt to deal in hyperboles, and seems here to have forgotten how readily his words could be submitted to the arithmetical test.

After all the exertions made through the machinery of advertisements, circulars, ruri-decanal chapters, and personal solicitation (unknown even to electioneering tactics), the leaders of that counter-irritation have left on record a presumptive evidence that the majority of the clergy are *not averse* to the entertainment of the question of Revision, and, probably (if they were at liberty to speak what they think), are *favourable* to it.

We say nothing here of the constituent elements of this interesting catalogue of 9,925 names, having entered largely into its details elsewhere.* But it is important once more to remind our readers that up to the time of the collection of these signatures, the public—and therefore *a fortiori* the clergy—had been industriously given to understand that the "Bench of Bishops were unanimously opposed to the measure." What effect such an impression was likely to produce on the more dependent portion of the clergy, not to mention those already basking in the sun of episcopal smiles, we leave others to judge. But if any one feels disposed to throw doubt on our insinuation, an appeal is open to the list itself, now published, in its second and revised edition, by Messrs. Bell and Daldy, Fleet Street.

There is much, too, to be gathered from the absence of certain names, as well as the presence of others. An examination of the list of the entire Clergy, by the side of this of the 10,000, tells a *silent* tale which should speak volumes to the wise. For example, why is the author of the "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury" absent from the list? Surely Dr.

* See "Advance of the Ten Thousand," Letter LXXXII., p. 67.

Hook's is a name whose vast experience at Coventry, Leeds, and Chichester, should outweigh some hundreds of the beardless deacons who help to make up this "vast majority of the Clergy." Where is the Dean of St. Paul's, the venerable and learned Dr. Milman?—was not he canvassed to join his brother (Trench) of Westminster, in adding the weight of his authority to this portentous document?—Where the Dean of Durham, the historian of the Church, the enlightened Dr. Waddington?—Where, we believe we may ask, the Deans of Bristol (Elliott), Carlisle (Close), Exeter, Hereford, Gloucester, Lichfield, Lincoln, Manchester (Bowers), Norwich (Pellew), Christchurch Oxford (Liddell), Ripon (Goode), Rochester, St. Asaph, St. David's, Salisbury, Wells, Windsor (Wellesley), and Worcester, or if there be any other letter in the alphabet of Deans?—Is not the negative testimony of these two-and-twenty individuals,—who have all been (or are presumed to have been) promoted above their brethren for some eminent qualities of learning, piety, or research,—is not, we ask, their negative testimony worth a whole cartload of signatures picked up, many of them compulsorily, in the highways and hedges of the Church? And if *seven* of the same order are found to have signed, should not those seven be subjected to a severer scrutiny than ordinary, with a view to test their value as contrasted with three times that number who could not be induced to do so? We spare to say more,—but surely never was there a more striking illustration of the crafty being trapped in the work of their own hands, "the engineer hoist with his own petard."

To pass on to the next memorable event of the year 1860, Liturgically considered, we may mention the Address of the late Bishop of Carlisle (Villiers) to some of the Clergy of his diocese, in favour of Revision.* This document has the

* See Letter LXXVI., p. 31.

merit of having been the first public demonstration of a division in the Episcopal camp, and may, therefore, be ranked as of equal importance with the subsequent more pronounced opinions of the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately)* and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Baring),† who have thus for ever dispelled the halo of *unanimity* with which the Sacred Conclave had up to the present time environed their order.

The grand feature, however, of the year has been the renewal by Lord Ebury of his motion in the House of Lords, albeit the motion itself met with but little success.

Regarded calmly at the distance of six months, the great gain to the Revisionist cause from the debate of 1860 is this,—that all that was said then, and all that was written upon the occasion, did not rebut one substantial argument in favour of the measure. Not a word was uttered against it by the Minister of the day; not a word by any of the ex-Ministers. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner) and Bishop of London (Tait) spoke as if with a design to betray

* Letters LXXXVIII.—XCI., pp. 107—125.

† Letters XCVIII.—XCIX., pp. 158—166. This last-named Bishop signalised his episcopate by an able Charge last autumn to the Clergy of Durham, from which the following extract is taken (as reported in the *Rock* of Sept. 27, 1878):—"He denounced in vigorous language the re-introduction of the corruptions of the Church of Rome by the lawless efforts of Ritualists. He especially condemned the adoration of the Real Presence in the Holy Communion, and the virtual enforcement of the duty of private confession and absolution. He said that, spreading among the younger clergy, and tolerated by the older High Church party, these ideas were making headway till the English Church Union can boast of one-eighth of the whole clergy being on its roll of members. History repeated itself to those who would be warned by its voice, and as the school of Laud directly led to the Great Rebellion and overthrow of the Church, so now the unchecked progress of Ritualism would inevitably destroy the Establishment." We regret to learn, while this sheet was passing through the press, that this excellent and truly Protestant Bishop has been compelled from ill-health to resign a see which he had held with dignity and usefulness for the last seventeen years. (Dec. 14, 1878.)

the cause of the Anti-Revisionists; while the intemperate language of the only other Prelate who addressed the House (Wilberforce) indicated a painful consciousness that he was occupying an untenable position, and fighting in a losing battle.

The same inference is fairly deducible from the Charge of another Right Reverend Prelate (Thirlwall),* delivered towards the close of the year, in which, by a laborious effort to explain the part he had himself played in the matter, the author afforded a singular illustration of the well-known adage, *qui s'excuse s'accuse*. Neither Lord Ebury nor any of his followers have hitherto found it necessary to *defend* their conduct. They have borne their full share of personal abuse and gross misrepresentation, but it has all recoiled on the heads of those who wielded such weapons, leaving the objects of their wrath unoffended, because unaffected thereby. If the jade wince under the application of the lash, the presumption is that a sore place has been hit;—"coarse insinuation and misplaced ridicule" should fall harmless upon one armed strong in the justice of his cause.†

We may note in conclusion that the past year has added considerably to the stock of Revisionist tracts, amongst which may be specially numbered Bingham's "Liturgia Recusa," Gell's "Thoughts on the Liturgy," Mountfield's "Letters on Revision," and "The Prayer-book Remodelled." Mr. Fisher's "Liturgical Purity" has also appeared in a second and carefully revised edition, and "Lord Ebury's Speech" in a third.

Public lectures have been delivered at Portsmouth, Chatham, Southsea, Sittingbourne, Shrewsbury, Ashbourne (Derbyshire), and at a few other places.‡ Everything, in short,

* See Letter cvi., p. 203.

† See Letter cvi., p. 206.

‡ Some of these lectures were afterwards published; we may particu-

indicates progress on the part of the movement; while on the other side is exhibited the languor of indifference, or the ill temper of unsuccessful opposition.

What the ensuing year may produce, time will show. Meanwhile the Revisionists are so far from relinquishing the ground they have gained, that it is evident they are meditating a further advance. Let their opponents beware whither that advance (if further resistance be offered) may ultimately tend. The advocates for a *temperate* review of the Prayer-book will not be to blame, if that Revision, which might have been quietly accomplished long ere this, and might still be effected without the slightest danger of disruption to the Church, be reserved for a time when her enemies shall be more numerous than her friends, and the present even balance of parties give way to a preponderance of those who, under pretence of reforming, would not unwillingly take the opportunity to destroy.*

I am, yours, &c.,

Jan. 17, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CVIII.

CANONICAL AND RUBRICAL REFORM.

“There is much rubbish; so that we are not able to build the wall.”—
NEHEM. iv. 10.

SIR,—Towards the latter part of the past year there issued from the press a small but not unimportant tract

larise those by the Rev. D. Mountfield, at Shrewsbury, Edward Webster, Esq., at Ashbourne, Derbyshire, and Rev. R. Bingham, at Southsea.

* There is no denying that the so-called “Liberationist Society” has made considerable progress since the above was written, and has enlisted into its ranks several even of the clergy from dissatisfaction at the existing state of the Church.

in the form of a letter to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Baring),* having for its object an exposure of the obsolete character of some of the existing Canons, and the inconsistency of the Rubric. This is perhaps the most vulnerable point in the armour of the *statu quoists*; and the author of the tract, the Rev. T. P. Boulton, has done good service in attacking it.

The topic is no new one, to be sure,—but it has been rather overlooked of late; and the consideration of it will form an agreeable diversion from the series of episcopal charges and speeches upon which we have been so long engaged.

Mr. Boulton confines himself on the present occasion to the Canons, promising that when he has succeeded in removing the mass of “wood, hay, straw, and stubble,” in which these are buried, he will in a future essay treat the Rubric in a similar manner.†

The pamphlet is addressed to Bishop Baring, as a corollary to his late Charge in favour of Revision,‡ which bold step on the part of one of the hierarchy has naturally enough encouraged the clergy in those parts to speak their mind, while in other dioceses the tongue is tied in deference to the expressed or understood opinions of those at the helm. The ex-Fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge, considers, and rightly so, that such a light as the Bishop’s Charge is calculated to diffuse was not intended by his lordship to be hid under a bushel, and so assists, to the best of his small ability, in setting it on a candlestick, that it may serve to illuminate other parts of the kingdom.

To quote his own words, Mr. Boulton writes as “one ardently attached to the Church of his fathers, and longing

* A Letter on Canonical and Rubrical Reform, by T. P. Boulton, M.A., late Fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge. Wertheim. 1860.

† This promise has not to our knowledge been hitherto fulfilled. (1878.)

‡ Letters xcvi., xcix., pp. 158—166.

to see her come forth with renewed youth to fight the battle of Christ." In this spirit the whole letter is conceived. It is written with great moderation, and with an absence of all desire to regard the Revision question from a party point of view; while at the same time no morbid delicacy intervenes to prevent a just exposure of the blemishes that deform, and the "rubbish" which overlays, the superficies of our religious system.

Commencing by a simile drawn from the material edifice, he asks, "What is usually the first process upon undertaking the repair of an antiquated castle or time-honoured cathedral? Is it not to clear away the unseemly heaps of crumbled mortar,* broken stones, and other accumulations round the base and within the courts, which mar the fair proportions of the building, give harbour to vermin, and afford congenial habitation to the unprofitable nettle? Let these be first removed, let the signs of neglect vanish, let the edifice stand out as originally designed by its founder, and we shall then be in a condition to judge what parts need strengthening, what renewing, and what may be susceptible of alteration or improvement."

Mutato nomine, this is exactly what is wanting as the preliminary step towards a thorough repair of the National Church; though, strange to say, a process entirely lost sight of by those in authority, or (certainly) not hitherto set about in a spirit commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

"Two centuries," observes our author, "have passed since the last ill-guided effort for the improvement of the Establishment; and alas! the hand of that disastrous and shameful time fell not heavier on the architecture of our Churches, than the merciless and fatuous rigour of its Act of Uni-

* See Letter LXXIX., p. 52; "Bingham's Liturgia Recusa."

formity did upon the worshippers therein. The consequence is, we have been ever since a divided people in our prayers, who might for the most part have knelt side by side in the house of God, as we have fought side by side in a thousand battles."

This is most true, and a standing reproach to the heads of the Church, from whom should emanate the first advance towards a better state of things, but who are, on the contrary, found in the front rank of opposition to every attempt at redress.

"Two centuries (proceeds this Canonical reformer) must, in all human things, accumulate much ruin and decay,—be they material or be they social. Why, then, not clear it away?—There it lies, offensive and disfiguring. The enemy mounts upon it, and mocks the decay of our sanctuary. Can we not unite at once with cart and spade, and clear the ground, so that our Church may stand forth as she ought to do; and afterwards, perhaps, in some things agree to modify and restore?"

Descending from metaphor to matter of fact, our author proceeds to call attention to the disused, impracticable, or contradictory rules of our Church. They lie in our way everywhere; stumbling-blocks to the timid, impediments to the conscientious, and actual bars to the scrupulous, who decline to take vows which in their *literal* signification no one does, because no one can, absolutely fulfil. It is these spots in our work of love which furnish topics for ridicule and sarcasm to the disaffected, while they pain the more sensitive members of the Church. Away, then, with them at once,—root and branch,—“bag and baggage,”*—why cumber they the ground?

* An expression become a byword since its adoption by a conspicuous ex-statesman in reference to expelling the Turk from Europe in 1877,—a feat not so easily accomplished as would be that suggested in the text.

"Twere long to tell what these spots are. A sample of them is given in the pamphlet before us, to which we would earnestly call the attention of all true members of the Church. This sample, however, is sufficient to show the greatness of the need for reform. The time is indeed come that we should go round about our Zion, "tell the towers thereof," and see well to her outworks. Oh that we might be able to do so without tumbling over the *débris* of two or three centuries' growth!—No effort of ours shall be wanting to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be wished, and we call upon all, who love their Church in sincerity, to join with us heart and hand in re-echoing the cry, "Come and help us."

I remain, yours, &c.,

January 30, 1861.

"INGOLDSBY."

POSTSCRIPT.

"Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour."—ECCLES. x. 1.

As every one has not ready access to the Book of Canons of 1604, it may be interesting to give here a short abstract of some of those still nominally in force, but in practice commonly disregarded.

Canon xxiii. enjoins that

"In all colleges and halls within both the Universities, all the masters, fellows, and scholars, and *all the rest* of the students, officers, and *other the servants there*, shall communicate four times in the year at least, kneeling reverently and decently on their knees, according to the order of the Communion Book prescribed in that behalf."

Canon xxix.* (as is well known) orders that

"No parent shall be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own child; neither shall any person be admitted Godfather or Godmother

* The ludicrous attempt of the Bishop of Oxford to repeal this isolated Canon has been noticed before. Letter LXXXVII., p. 107.

to any child at Christening or Confirmation, before the said person so undertaking hath received the Holy Communion."

Canon xxxv. enjoins that

"The Bishop, before he admits any person to holy orders, shall diligently examine him *in the presence* of those Ministers that shall assist him at the imposition of hands; and if the said Bishop have any lawful impediment, he shall cause the said Ministers carefully to examine every such person so to be ordained. And if any Bishop shall admit any to sacred orders who is not so qualified and examined, the Archbishop of his province, assisted by one Bishop, shall suspend the said Bishop so offending from making either Deacons or Priests for the space of two years."

Canon xxxvi. requires that

"No person be received into the Ministry except he shall first subscribe —

I.—That the King's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his Highness's dominions, as well in all *spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes*† as temporal; and that no foreign prince, &c.

II.—That the Book of Common Prayer containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God; and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed, in public prayer, *and administration of the sacraments*, and none other.

III.—That he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, &c., in 1562, and that he acknowledgeth *all and every* such articles, being in number nine-and-thirty, to be agreeable to the Word of God.

And for the avoiding of all ambiguities, shall subscribe in this form of words: I, N. N., do *willingly* and *ex animo* subscribe to these three articles above-mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them. And if any Bishop shall ordain, admit, or license any except he first have subscribed in manner and form as here appointed, he shall be suspended from giving orders and licenses to preach for the space of twelve months."

That the above Canon is *generally* observed in practice, is well known; but whether to the advantage of the National Church, or to the credit of those subscribing and those accepting the subscriptions, may well be questioned.

† This title appears to have been first assumed by Henry VIII., under an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1544. (Hume, Vol. III., chap. 33.)

Whatever value may attach to Bishop Colenso's recent work on the Pentateuch, or however much we may deplore that he should have deemed it incumbent on him as a solemn duty thus to sap the very foundation of ordinary faith in the Scripture story, it is impossible not to sympathise with him in the following remarks, which we extract from his concluding chapter :—

"It may be that the time is near at hand, in the ordering of God's providence, when a Missionary Bishop of the Church of England shall not be prevented, as I myself have been, from admitting to the Diaconate a thoroughly competent, well-trained, able and pious native, because he *must be ordained by the formularies of the Church of England*; and those require that he should not only subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledge the Book of Common Prayer, parts of which, *the nice distinctions of the Athanasian Creed for instance*, cannot possibly be translated into his language.

"I cannot say that I felt a religious scruple *myself* about ordaining a native candidate under such circumstances, though aware that, by the 36th Canon, I should have rendered myself liable to suspension. But *others about me* had scruples of this kind, and I deemed it best to defer to their judgment until I could lay the matter before the Church at home. I do now lay it before the Church."*

Canon xxxix. is (we believe) universally disregarded.

"None licensed, as is aforesaid, to preach, read lecture, or catechise, *coming to reside in any diocese*, shall be permitted there to preach, read lecture, catechise, or administer the Sacraments, *or to execute any other ecclesiastical function*, by what authority soever be he thereunto admitted, unless he first consent to subscribe to the above three Articles, in the presence of the Bishop of the Diocese wherein he is to preach, read lecture, catechise, or administer the Sacraments, as aforesaid."

Canon xl. contains the well-known oath against Simony, on the alleged ground that "buying and selling of livings is execrable before God :"—

"I, N. N., do swear that I have made no Simoniacal payment, contract, or promise, *directly or indirectly by myself or by any other*, to my knowledge, or with my consent, to any person or persons what-

* The Pentateuch, &c., by the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Longmans; 1862. Chap. xxiii., pp. 149, 150.

soever, *for or concerning* the procuring and obtaining of this Ecclesiastical dignity, place, preferment, office, or living,—nor will at any time hereafter perform or satisfy any such kind of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without my knowledge or consent : So help me God.”

Of the above it may be sufficient to say that it has utterly failed in securing the object named in its preamble, inasmuch as livings are openly “bought and sold,” the Canon notwithstanding; while we fear that the oath is constantly evaded in the spirit, though it may be observed to the letter. After all, too, everything depends upon the arbitrary interpretation of the epithet “Simoniacal,”—the ordinary acceptance of which, while it remains a bar to the scrupulous and timid, is notoriously gulped by those who are least calculated to add strength or efficiency to the Established Church.*

Canon xlviii. appoints that

“No Curate or Minister shall be *permitted to serve in any place*, without *examination* and admission of the Bishop of the Diocese. And the said Curates and Ministers, if they remove from one Diocese to another, shall not be *by any means* admitted to serve, without testimony of the *Bishop of the Diocese from whence they came*, in writing, of their *honesty, ability*, and conformity to the Ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England. Nor shall any serve more than one church or chapel upon one day, except that chapel be a member of the parish Church, or united thereto.”

Canon l. orders that

“Neither the Minister, Churchwardens, nor any other officers of the Church, *shall suffer any man to preach* within their churches or chapels, but such as, by showing their licence to preach, shall appear unto them to be sufficiently authorised thereunto.”

Canon lv. directs that

“Before *all sermons*, lectures, and homilies, the Preachers and Ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form, or to this effect:—‘Ye shall pray for Christ’s holy Catholic Church, &c.’—*always concluding with the Lord’s Prayer.*”

It is needless to say that this form is no longer observed

* The Report of the Commission on Subscription (1865) recommends this Canon for revision.

except in cathedral and university churches ; while the omission of the Lord's Prayer has been especially sanctioned of late by episcopal authority !*

Canon lix. requires that

"Every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, upon every Sunday and Holy-day, before Evening Prayer, shall for half an hour or more examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish in the Ten Commandments, the Articles of the Belief, and in the Lord's Prayer, and shall diligently hear, instruct, and teach them the Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. And all fathers, mothers, masters, and mistresses shall cause their children, servants, and apprentices, which have not learned the Catechism, to *come to the church at the time appointed*, obediently to hear, and to be ordered by the Minister, until they have learned the same.

And if any Minister neglect his duty herein, let him be sharply reprovèd upon the first complaint. If, after submitting himself, he shall wilfully offend therein again, let him be suspended. If so the third time, *then excommunicated*, and so remain until he will be reformed !

And likewise, if any of the said fathers, children, servants, or apprentices, shall neglect, as aforesaid, let them be suspended by their Ordinaries—if they be not children—and if they so persist by the space of a month, *then let them be excommunicated.*"

Canon lxxv. is a remarkable illustration of the manner in which this body of statutes is gone into hopeless desuetude. It enjoins that

"All Ordinaries shall, in their several jurisdictions, carefully see and give order, that as well those who for obstinate refusing to frequent Divine Service, as those also—*especially of the better sort and condition*—who for notorious contumacy, or other notable crimes, stand lawfully excommunicate—unless within three months they reform themselves and obtain the benefit of absolution—be every six months ensuing, as well in the parish church as in the cathedral church of the Diocese, by the Minister openly in time of Divine Service, upon some Sunday, *denounced and declared excommunicate*, that others may be thereby admonished to refrain their society, and excited to procure out a writ *De excommunicato capiendo*, thereby to bring them into due order and obedience."

Canon lxxiv. is a fit corollary to the last, as ordaining that

* See Vol. I., Letter II, p. 7.

“All Ecclesiastical persons shall usually wear in their journey cloaks with sleeves, commonly called priests’ cloaks, without guards, welts, long buttons, or ents. And *no Ecclesiastical person shall wear any coif or wrought night-cap, but only plain night-caps of black silk, satin, or velvet.* In private houses, and in their studies, the said persons Ecclesiastical may use any comely and scholarlike apparel, *provided it be not cut or pinkt*; and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassoeks; and *also that they wear not any light-coloured stockings.* Likewise poor Beneficed Men and Curates, *not being able to provide themselves long gowns,** may go in short gowns, of the fashion aforesaid.”

Of this last Canon it may well be said,

“Nil ultra quo jam progrediatur habet.”

Having, therefore, now extracted about a tithe of this obsolete code of *laws* (being altogether 141 in number), and having, we fear, sufficiently wearied our readers by the painful recitation, we shall leave the curious to draw for the remainder at the fountain-head. There is one Canon, however, which demands a brief notice in conclusion, as having been recently made the subject of a Parliamentary discussion with a view to its repeal.

Canon lxxvi. orders that

“No man being admitted a Deacon or Minister, shall from thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the same, nor afterwards use himself *in the course of his life* as a layman, upon pain of excommunication.”

There can be no doubt that the effect of this Canon adds materially to the other influences, to which we have before alluded,† as acting to deter men of the higher grade

* We presume this is the origin of the modern practice of a certain class of the clergy perambulating their parishes in “long gowns,” after the fashion of Popish priests on the Continent. (1878.)

† See Letter *et.*, p. 176. The late Bishop of Manchester (Prince Lee) observed at a Meeting of the Church Building Society, “It has been a matter of sincere concern to me, for two or three years past, that we are in want of more efficient candidates for the ministry. I should be sorry indeed ever to find that we are placed again in the position in which we were a few years since, of having churches provided faster than we could obtain

of attainments from entering the clerical profession. It may well be questioned whether the Church would not be rather a gainer than a loser in the long run by relaxing her hold upon an *unwilling servant*, in order, thereby, to make room for another whose heart and soul would be in his work.*

LETTER CIX.

A LAYMAN'S THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH.

“Caput inter nubila condit.”—VIRGIL.

SIR,—We regard anonymous pamphlets with no favour; and are therefore sorry that the writer of the one we are now about to notice has thought fit to conceal his name, —to walk, in short (as says our motto), with his head shrouded in thick clouds and darkness.

The tract to which we refer is entitled, “An Address to the Laity of the Church of England upon the Errors

ministers for them. Bitter indeed would be the grief, and sad the loss to the Church of England, should the standard of her clergy be lowered. We must have men of earnestness and piety, but we must also have men of learning and of patient research. The people around us, thanks to the different measures which have been introduced, are rising daily in intelligence, and they must be met by corresponding intelligence and information on the part of their ministers; and I do trust that the time will never come when I shall fail to reject from the ministry those whom I believe not fully competent to undertake its duties.” To which may be added (valeat quantum) the testimony of the Bishop of Natal:—“It is a fact which has been lamented by more than one of the English Bishops, and which *every Colonial Bishop* must still more sorrowfully confess, that the great body of the more intelligent students of our Universities no longer come forward to devote themselves to the service of the Church.”—*The Pentateuch*, by the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, Pref., p. xxiii.

* This burden is now happily removed from the Clergy: a *third* point gained by the much-abused agitation of the Reformers. (1878.)

and Abuses which Exist in that Church, with Suggested Reforms," by a Layman.*

Had the author been a clergyman, we could the more readily have excused the concealment of his name. When one Bishop (Hamilton)† forbids the smallest deviation from prescript rule in the Church Service, "even though working for good," in a parish;—when another (Wigram) launches his thunderbolt against "whiskers, cricket, and archery," as alike unbecoming the sacredness of the profession;—and a third (Wilberforce) denounces "suspension" as the penalty for "afternoon and evening celebrations of the Holy Communion,"‡ and *that* under authority of "the very learned Chancellor of my diocese;"—it is not surprising that a clerk in orders should be shy of attaching his name to such thoughts as have found utterance in the pamphlet before us.

The preamble is perhaps the only paragraph which a clergyman might have put forth without fear of incurring episcopal censure, though we are by no means sure that it would meet with episcopal approbation.

"It is an incontrovertible fact," observes our author, "that however excellent an institution may be at its formation, so much frailty and imperfection attaches to everything human, that unless careful watchfulness be exercised, corruptions and abuses are almost certain to arise, tending to frustrate the original intention or design." The truth of this observation all experience confirms; and yet, alas! as far as regards the Liturgy of our Church, to which a great part of the Layman's remarks are directed, nothing has been done for the last two hundred years towards arresting or correcting this deteriorating process. We believe the same cannot be

* London: Effingham Wilson. 1861.

† See Vol. I., Letter LXI., p. 367.

‡ See next Letter; pp. 238-9.

said of any other institution, moral or physical, connected with our national polity.

Proceeding to apply his principle to the Established Church, our author guards himself by a declaration of entire friendliness towards it. He was born and educated within its pale; is attached to it on principle; and, being somewhat advanced in years, feels warranted in stating "his firm belief that it contains the best form of public worship extant." And, yet, notwithstanding all this, "he is not blind to its defects, which he deploras, and which he sincerely desires to see removed, in order that the many excellences which exist therein may become the more apparent."

Would that certain of our prelates could be induced to direct their energies where reformation is so greatly needed, instead of trenching upon the province of the hair-dresser, or interfering with that liberty of action which is due to the education and intelligence of the clergy, and without which the class must degenerate into abject slavery, and become so many ciphers* in a land of professed civil and religious freedom.

Proceeding to examine piecemeal the alleged defects in our Book of Common Prayer, the writer dwells chiefly upon those remnants of Popery† which not unnaturally adhere to a document having received its first review at a time when the national faith was still in suspense, and its last touch when the crown was on the head of one more than half suspected of a leaning towards Romanism; and he argues that, when traces of imperfection in this respect are to be met with, our duty is to eradicate the mischief without delay.

* It is probably for this reason that the clergy have been designated the *neutral* sex, and not altogether without justification, when the serfdom of their position is borne in mind. (1878.)

† See an exhaustive pamphlet on this subject, entitled "Germes of Popery in the Book of Common Prayer." MAYNARD, 17, Buckingham Street, W.C.

We cannot pursue in detail a matter which we have already so largely entered on. Suffice it to say that the old points are brought up again, and ably handled;—the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, the Athanasian Creed, the Communion, the Burial of the Dead, the Ordination of Priests, and Consecration of Bishops.

The length of the Church Service commands likewise a considerable portion of our Layman's attention.

"In the morning," he complains, "we have three separate services united in one—namely, Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion. The consequence of which jumble is, that there are many repetitions of the same prayers, which so increases the number of them, that it causes a hurried and irreverent manner to get through them all."

This has been denied by others. But let the facts speak for themselves. Is it, or is it not, true that the Lord's Prayer is usually repeated five times in the Morning Service, and may be (when there is a Communion or a churching of women, in addition) six or seven times? Is not a form of Belief rehearsed twice? the Collect of the day twice? and in Advent and Lent another Collect, repeated for several successive Sundays? Are not prayers for the Queen and Royal Family added in various forms, and at several times, with other minor repetitions of prayer and praise? It is no argument to say, this is an old grievance, and has been urged often before. The question is,—is it, or is it not, a grievance?—and if so, why is it not redressed? and why do those who should redress it throw every impediment in the way of others who are willing and anxious to undertake the work?

Our author next proceeds to comment on the system of training for the ministry; the nomination of Bishops by the Crown; the appointment to livings; and, finally, the respective incomes of Bishops and Clergy. These are grave subjects, especially the second and third, to which we think

sufficient attention is not always given by those in whose hands such appointments rest. We shall in vain look for a pure stream if the fountain-head be braekish or muddy. And so long as the patrons of livings continue to look upon their benefices as a marketable article, to be disposed of to the highest bidder, or given to a relative or dependent, without due regard to his fitness for the office, so long will the Church be maimed in her right hand, and be powerless for those purposes of spiritual good which is her destiny, and should be her boast.

Upon the question of Episcopal incomes we do not think full justice is done by our author to the position of a bishop. We have not spared to censure their lordships when they seemed to us deserving of censure; but in the matter of income, we do not consider them over-paid for the work they have to do in these stirring days, and the way in which it is expected to be done. If the £5,000 a year, now allowed to most of the Sees, is properly administered (as in the majority of cases we believe it is), such a sum is not more than sufficient for the never-ending still-beginning drain upon the Bishop's purse for public and private charities, societies, assisting the poorer clergy, with their widows and orphans, in his diocese, church building, church restoration, schools, institutes, libraries, infirmaries, and the like—to say nothing of the unavoidable expenses of travelling, and the needful hospitality which his office entails upon him beyond any other individual in the kingdom. We might add that, in the case of his being a married man with a family, a religious obligation rests upon him to provide liberally, by insurance, for those whom he must leave behind him in a very different condition to that to which they had been accustomed during the Bishop's life.

So far, therefore, from agreeing here with the Layman, we think him in error in his view of the case; which we

regret the more, as it tends to throw discredit upon his previous arguments, as if he were actuated by a spirit of envious detraction, cloaked under the colour of a desire for improving the Establishment.

Let his other reforms be carried out:—Let the Prayer-book be made what it easily *might*, and certainly *ought* to be:—Let the services be reasonably abbreviated, all repetitions removed, all antiquated rubrics reformed, *all vestiges of Popery expunged**:—Let ministers be duly trained for their work; and *above all* none but fit (and where possible *the fittest*) persons be appointed to Bishoprics, and presented to livings by Lay as well as Episcopal and Capitular patrons:—and he might spare us the trouble of examining into Bishops' salaries.

The labourer is worthy of his hire. The *skilled* labourer must be paid proportionally. If Bishops and Deans do not come under this latter category, the fault is not so much with themselves as with those who recommend them to the Crown. To be a faithful steward in such a post, a liberal income is as essential as superior talents or great acquirements. The levelling principle advocated in this tract, if applied to the salaries of Ministers of State, Judges, Physicians, Officers in the Army or Navy, and the like, would be fatal to efficiency in those departments. And we see not why the rule should not apply equally to the Church, unless we would have it filled, more than it is already, with the off-casts of all other professions. Nay, from the considerations above mentioned, (which are rather under than over-stated,) we are decidedly of opinion that for the highest order in the Ministry a larger income is requisite than for a judge, an admiral, a field-marshal, or a Secretary of State, or indeed for any office of

* See Speech of Rev. J. S. Blackwood, D.D. (formerly Vicar of Middleton-Tyas, Yorkshire), at the annual meeting of the Prayer-book Revision Association, 1867. W. J. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street.

labour and responsibility known to our civil or military constitution.

With the exception of this last chapter, we heartily commend this treatise to general perusal, and remain,

Yours, &c.,

Feb. 14, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CX.

EXAMINATION FOR BISHOPRICS, AND OTHER DIGNITIES IN
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

“Totidem audiet, atque
Respicere ignoto discet pendentia tergo.”—HOR.

“He does but jest. Bishops examined in jest.
No offence i’ the world.”—HAMLET (*Travesty*).

“If competitive examination be a sound thing, then ecclesiastically it should be applied to Bishop-making.”—*Notes of my Life*, by G. A. DENTON, chap. ii., p. 29.

SIR,—Forty years have elapsed since Sydney Smith wrote one of his most caustic essays, entitled “Persecuting Bishops,” in the form of a Review of Bishop Marsh’s *Eighty-seven Printed Questions* propounded to candidates for orders in the Diocese of Peterborough.

The Bishop is supposed by the witty Canon to have repelled the attack, thus made on his prerogative, in the following words:—

REVEREND SIR,—I shall do what I please.—Yours faithfully,
HERBERT PETERBOROUGH.

Of course, my lord, rejoined the Canon—in reply to this curt “*Sic volo, sic jubeo*” of the Bishop’s—of course you *can do so*, if you like; but it may be as well gently to remind

* George Manwaring, King William Street, London. 1861.

your lordship that there is such a thing as public opinion, and that those who wear the mitre work by character as well as power.

The Canon proceeds as follows :—

“The worst enemy of the Church of England is a bustling, bitter, theological Bishop, accused by his clergy of tyranny and oppression; a stalking horse for the introduction of revolutionary opinions, mischievous ridicule, and irreligious feelings. Six such Bishops, multiplied by eighty-seven, and working with five hundred and twenty-two questions, would fetch everything to the ground in less than six months.

“But what if *every* prelate were afflicted with the spirit of putting eighty-seven questions, and the two Archbishops with the spirit of putting twice as many, and the Bishop of Sodor and Man with the spirit of putting only forty-three queries? There would then be a grand total of two thousand three hundred and thirty-five interrogations flying about the English Church, and sorely vexed would the land be with question and answer.”*

It is probably in great measure owing to this piece of timely raillery that, from the year 1821 to 1861, the priests and deacons of the Anglican Church have not been subjected to a repetition of such cruelty as was then attempted, and in part perpetrated, in the diocese of the Right Reverend Herbert Marsh.†

The tables are now turned; and some wag—instigated thereto by a revival of Episcopal tyranny and self-importance in a certain quarter—has projected an imaginary examination of all candidates for bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities,

* Sydney Smith's Works, Vol. II., p. 6. Longmans. 1840.

† That the “spirit of putting questions” to “the inferior clergy, the priests and deacons,” is not yet utterly extinct among the Hierarchy, is evident from a specimen furnished in the diocese of Lincoln, January, 1873. See Letter cxxxI., on “Inquisitorial Bishops and Rural Deans.”

based upon *fifty questions*, which he proposes to be *printed* for universal usage. He shows himself more merciful in this respect than Herbert Peterborough. He further allows his candidates free use of the Scriptures, the Early Fathers, and Ecclesiastical history, during the examination. Nor does he limit them to either time or space for making their answer, as was done in Bishop Marsh's case. All our author requires is, a categorical reply to certain specific inquiries upon certain alleged difficulties in the Book of Common Prayer; and the success, or the reverse, of the candidate is supposed to rest upon his answer to these fifty questions proving satisfactory to the Board of examiners.

The point of this spirited squib will be best appreciated by our giving first a sample of Bishop Marsh's catechism for holy orders.

§ ii. OF JUSTIFICATION, IN REFERENCE TO ITS CAUSE.

1. Does not the 11th Article declare that we are justified by Faith *only*?—Does not the expression “Faith only” derive additional strength from the negative expression in the same Article, “and *not* for our own works?”—Does not, therefore, the 11th Article *exclude* good works from all share in the office of justifying? or can we so construe the word “Faith” in that Article, as to make it *include* good works?

2. Do not the 12th and 13th Articles *further* exclude them—the one by asserting that good works follow after justification; the other by maintaining that they *cannot precede* it?

3. Can that, which never precedes an effect, be reckoned among the causes of that effect?

4. Can we, then, consistently with our Articles, reckon the performance of good works among the *causes* of justification, whatever qualifying epithet be used with the term *cause*?

Who is not familiar with the well-known lines,

“If you had seen these roads before they were made,
You would lift up your hands and bless General Wade!”

Upon the like principle let all priests and deacons who may have been ordained since the year 1821, and all who intend to take that holy estate upon them, lift up their hearts and canonise the memory of Sydney Smith for having rescued

them from such an intolerable abuse of power as is implied in the above specimen of an examination for holy orders.

And now for the "fifty questions," which the *Lex talionis* of our anonymous author has in fancy imposed on all future bishops, deans, archdeacons, and prebendaries of the Church.

They are ranged under various heads, after the Peterborough prototype, and comprise *inter alia* queries upon the nature of Priestly Absolution, the Descent into hell of the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Baptismal Services, Godfathers and Godmothers, the Communion Service, Confirmation, the Ordaining of Priests, and the Consecration of Bishops.

In addition to the above, there are three pages devoted to an inquiry as to how far the two tables of the law, as given in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, are applicable to those living under the Christian dispensation. We read these pages with regret. In the first place, as wholly irrelevant to the main object of our author, which professes to be the improvement, not the injury, of Christian morals as inculcated by the Established Church. But, secondly, as being (in our judgment) based on error, and calculated to do mischief. Our Saviour came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil; the Christian dispensation is an enlargement, *not a subversion*, of the Mosaic.

It is time, however, that we gave a sample of the queries which form the bulk of this imaginary Episcopal examination:—

§ i. THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Question 1. What do you understand by the expression in the Communion Service—"rightly and duly administer thy Holy Sacraments?"—and do you consider it essential to the rightly and duly administering of the Lord's Supper, that the words used in presenting the bread and wine should be *separately* addressed to each communicant?

2. Are you of opinion that it adds to the solemnity of this rite of our holy religion, or conduces to a reverential feeling on the part of those who join in it, that the same words should, in the case of there

being 150 communicants, be repeated 150 times, or oftener, as the case may be? and that, when the Sacrament is administered by two, three, or four clergymen, the performance should take place in duett, trio, or quartett?

3. On the first institution of the Sacrament—on the first occasion, that is to say, when bread and wine were thus symbolically received,—in what manner do they appear to have been offered to the recipients, and how many were they? Give your authority.

§ ii. BAPTISMAL VOW—GODFATHERS AND GODMOTHERS.

Question 1. Is there any trace of the practice of Godfathers and Godmothers intervening in the baptism of infants during the Apostolic age?

2. At what period, and by what authority, was the baptismal vow introduced into the administration of baptism?

3. The engagement made by Godfathers and Godmothers is thus stated in the Catechism:—

“They did promise and vow three things in my name;

1st. That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the poms and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh.

2ndly. That I should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith.

3rdly. That I should keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life.”

Do you believe that in the case of infants arriving at the age of puberty this promise and vow has been generally kept and observed? Can you name any single instance, within your own knowledge, where it has been so kept? and if not, do you think it right that any mere human authority should impose or require it?

§ iii. THE ORDAINING OF PRIESTS, AND CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS.

Question 1. By whom, and on what occasion, were the following words originally spoken, and to whom were they addressed?—

“Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”*

2. Did St. Paul or any inspired person make use of these words in ordaining Bishops or Elders? If you answer in the affirmative, prove your statement from Scripture, or from authentic Church history.

3. Is it, or is it not, implied in the words “Receive the Holy Ghost,” that the gift of the Holy Spirit is imparted to the person to whom they are addressed?

4. If this power exists in our Church, can it be denied that it exists also in the Church of Rome?

* On this form in our Ordination Service see before, Letter LXXIII., p. 19.

5. If this cannot be denied, how do you reconcile the possession of the Holy Spirit by the Ministers of that Church with the existence of all the corruptions and abuses which prevail in its doctrines and ministrations,—the prevalence of which, as a Minister of the Reformed Church, you are bound to admit?

Now we are aware that answers of some kind or other may be given, have been given,* and are to be found in the books, to all these questions and the rest of the *posers* submitted to public criticism in this very original tract. How far such answers are calculated to give satisfaction to an impartial Board of examiners we leave them to judge, and are thankful not to be called upon to pronounce *placet* or *non placet* on the occasion.

But there is one point upon which we are quite clear; and that is, that while the enemy are thus attacking the very citadel of the Established Church, it is highly inexpedient that its members should be subjected to the annoyance of “a bustling, bitter, theological Prelate,” tyrannising over his clergy, and reducing his diocese to a species of discipline, paralleled only by that of some ill-ordered dame’s school.

As facts are more conclusive than declamation, we will support our statement by reference to the lately published Charge of the Bishop of Oxford† (Wilberforce), on the cover of which, by way of adding dignity to its contents, are conspicuously exhibited his lordship’s titles of “Lord High Almoner to Her Majesty the Queen, and Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.” We can hardly conceive that her Most Gracious Majesty would sanction with her approval such a passage as the following:—

“Any clergyman celebrating the Holy Communion in *this diocese* in the Afternoon or Evening subjects himself to the *penalty of suspension*.”—(Charge, p. 17.)

* Witness (valeant quantum) Dr. Vaughan’s Five Discourses on the Revision of the Liturgy. Macmillan; Cambridge. 1860.

† See Charge by the Bishop of Oxford, Nov., 1860. Parker.

After the example of our friend the Examiner, we should like to ask the Bishop,—

“At what hour of the day was the Lord’s Supper originally instituted ; and by whose authority was the celebration ever limited to any fixed time ? ”

The next specimen of Episcopal tyranny which this Charge exhibits is as follows,—and is worth preserving, as a curious illustration of tithing mint, anise, and cummin, to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and truth :—

“The general complaisance I have noted with the order in the Rubric, to which at my last visitation I called your *special attention*, which directs *the exact time in the Service* at which the *Minister himself* shall place the elements upon the holy table, relieves me from all need of *further admonition* hereupon.”—(Charge, p. 44.)

Our Examiner would probably ask the Bishop,—

“By whom were the bread and wine placed on the table at the original institution of this rite ; and what authority have you for supposing that the Apostles or Ministers of the Early Church performed this part of the office with *their own hands* ? ”

Two other extracts from the Charge will suffice to show that a Sydney Smith is still required as a constituent element in our ecclesiastical polity, and cannot safely be dispensed with, unless the Clergy (as a class) are to be allowed to sink beneath the level of village school-boys, or tenants at will :*—

“1. No alteration of *any kind* must be made, either by the Clergyman or the Churchwardens, in our churches, their fabric, or *their arrangement*, without MY having been first consulted, and having decided whether or not I ought to require that a faculty of *my* court be applied for to authorise the change.”—(Charge, p. 45.)

* It is quite possible that the present confessedly debased standard of the Parochial clergy is traceable in some measure to such specimens of Episcopal interference with their liberty as are given above ; 1878.

So a clergyman who falls heir to a pulpit facing the north-east, when he has a predilection for addressing his congregation south by south-west,—another who succeeds to a parish where the females have been for generations *arranged on one side of the aisle, and the males on the opposite*,—a third who prefers delivering the prayers and lessons from the old-fashioned reading-desk, to shifting alternately from lectern to faldstool, as had been done by his predecessor for the last five years,—must on no account presume to make *any alteration* in these points, *even with the approval of his churchwarden*, and to the greater accommodation of his flock, until application has been made to his diocesan, and the sanction of *his court* first had and obtained.

“2. No stranger must presume to officiate on *two Sundays* in any church (in the diocese of Oxford) without the Bishop’s leave being first *asked and received*. *Once* such a thing may be allowed, as unavoidable;—but *twice*—do it at your peril.”

This last injunction, it must be observed, rests wholly on the authority of the fiftieth Canon;* being one of a code whose force would be equally valid to justify this busy, bustling bishop in requiring all the Clergy of his diocese to wear only *plain night-caps of black silk*, and forbidding them on any account to appear in public *in light-coloured hose*.†

“O Herbert Peterborough, thou art mighty yet!
Thy spirit walks abroad.”

We hold such petty tyranny to be a scandal and an insult to the whole clerical body, and deserving of being resented by every man of spirit in the profession.‡ Well may this persecuting Bishop complain, as he does elsewhere

* See Letter cviii., p. 224.

† Canon lxxiv., p. 225-6.

‡ But, alas! such daring spirits are few and far between—

“Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto:”

such not being the road to Rural Deaneries, Honorary Canonries—and
“brighter things than these!” (1878.)

in his Charge, that “none but *little* men now enter into holy orders.” What man of mind, what man with a character to lose, or to sustain, would knowingly subject himself to a thralldom greater than he had quailed under before donning his freshman’s gown,—the *toga virilis* which first taught him to feel and understand that he was a free-born Englishman?

Away henceforth with all liberty of thought and action; away with independence of look, word, or gesture—in the Church—and in their place accept with thankfulness the smiles of your diocesan, for the “ready compliance you have rendered to his order, in observing the *exact time* in the service at which you are *yourself* to place the elements upon the Holy Table.”

Six such bishops, we do not hesitate to say (in the words of our clerical Hampden), working with six such triennial charges, would drive every independent Oxford and Cambridge graduate out of the Church in less than ten years.

None but men mean in intellect, as grovelling in disposition, would condescend to remain in it.

I am, yours, &c.,

Feb. 27, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXI.

REV. CHRISTOPHER NEVILE ON THE PRAYER-BOOK.

“Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother’s way.”—Rom. xiv. 13.

SIR,—The so-called guardians of the Church have themselves to thank if each succeeding month brings forth some new pamphlet exposing the weak parts of our venerable

parent. Had the Bishops as a body—for there are two or three honourable exceptions—yielded to Lord Ebury's reasonable proposal of 1858, that a Royal Commission should issue for an inquiry into the Book of Common Prayer, what a world of attack and defence would have been spared; how much smaller a concession would have satisfied many of those who are now leagued together in demanding a revision of some of the most fundamental doctrines of the Established Church.

Mr. Fisher, indeed, had raised his single standard in the North, inscribed with the motto, "Liturgical Purity our Rightful Inheritance." But a mere handful of obscure clerks had as yet rallied round it; and it is more than probable that his *brutum fulmen* would have ended in smoke, had the ruling powers taken timely warning, and set their house in order while yet the cry for reform was confined within such narrow limits.

But it is the misfortune with some people never to know the proper time for yielding; and as former agitations for Revision had been known to die away after a while,* the good easy fathers of the Church were fain to flatter themselves it would be so again, and things might go on quietly, as they had before done, *for their day*. They have for once, however, we suspect, reckoned without their host. The cry has become louder and louder; the little band has gone on from strength to strength; and if not yet very formidable either for numbers or for influence, it is undoubtedly on the increase, and still gaining confidence in its powers, as well as in the admitted justice of its cause. The tone of the allied army is more determined, their attitude more defiant;—they cease to whine, and are now heard to bark. The next step to this is to bite; and something very like biting is

* See Letter xxiii., Vol. I., p. 163.

the style of the tract we last had occasion to review.* When a layman talks of subjecting the Prelates themselves to an examination, though the thing be but imagined in jest,† the combat has come to close quarters; and it will behove the Right Reverend Bench to see well to their footing, if they mean to persist any longer in their obstinate resistance to all reform.

The tide being once turned, other aggressive assaults will quickly follow. And of this nature is a letter recently addressed to Lord Ebury, as leader of the Revisionists, by the Rev. Christopher Nevile, of Thorney Abbey, which we now proceed to notice.‡

Mr. Nevile is a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, and is the author of several other tracts,—in particular a “Review of Newman’s Lectures on Romanism,” and a “Defence of Paley’s Moral Philosophy” against the unwarranted objections of Professors Whewell and Sedgwick. He has also recently published a small volume entitled, “Analysis of Church Principles,” in which, amongst some rather wild theories, will be found a good deal of excellent matter bearing on the Church.

Such a man is entitled to speak with some authority, and he has done so in the Letter now lying before us. He appeals from the Bishops in Convocation (in which last body he has no confidence—as which of us has?) to the conscience of “every intelligent *day labourer* or *working man* in this great nation, to whom God in his merey has given a copy of the New Testament and the means of reading it.”

This is a bold move, and a new and formidable feature in the present agitation. Men do not use to appeal a

* Letter cx., p. 233. “Examination for Bishoprics, &c.”

† See motto to Letter cx., p. 233.

‡ A Letter to Lord Ebury on the Present State of the Church. By the Rev. Christopher Nevile. London: Ridgway. 1861.

Cæsare ad populum for nothing. It is seldom done until all other methods have failed; but when done, as a last resort, it has seldom been known to fail itself. It was done by Luther; it was done by Cromwell; it was done by Earl Grey and Lord John Russell; it was done by Cobden: and in each case with well-known results. He was no mean judge of human nature who wrote:—

“Sed periit postquam *cerdonibus* esse timendus
Ceperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum cæde madenti.”*—

And if Mr. Nevile can succeed in enlisting the cobblers, tailors, and stocking weavers on his side, we venture confidently to predict that the day of Revision is not far distant. The difficulty is how to get at these people. This is not a question of the price of bread, or a vote at the hustings. Such people have now-a-days their meeting-house to go to, if they care to go anywhere for the purpose of public worship; and we fear they will hardly trouble themselves to buy or to read Mr. Nevile’s pamphlet, though offered at the rate of sixpence a dozen, or a hundred for half-a-crown. Popular lectures might do something, and have been attempted with appreciable success.† But the subject is above the comprehension of the million, and as it does not affect their pockets,‡ will never (in our opinion) materially trouble their brains.

However, to those who *are* capable of understanding Mr. Nevile’s argument, it may be interesting to know that he undertakes to show how the Word of God is frequently superseded or overridden by the Thirty-nine Articles and the Act of Uniformity; taking, by way of one illustration, the

* Juv., Sat. iv. 153, of the Emperor Nero.

† See Letter cvii., p. 215.

‡ The author is confirmed in this opinion by the experience and observation of twenty more years since the above was written. (1878.)

doctrine of Original Sin—(a doctrine we may observe, in passing, rather over the head of the Lincolnshire ploughboy and Lancashire operative)—which doctrine, he observes, “every minister of the Established Church is bound to receive word for word as embodied in the language of an article 300 years old.” Assuming that in this particular instance the article may be in accordance with Scripture, and in itself sufficiently clear and intelligible,—what of the remaining thirty-eight? Is there to be no such thing henceforth as the exercise of private judgment within the bounds of the Establishment?—no thought, no study, no interpretation beyond that which is written? Was everything so well understood on these subjects in 1562, that the door of inquiry is to be locked, and the key broken up and sold for old iron?—Will not the minds of both teacher and taught grow rusty like the lock itself, if its wards are never again to be stirred?—Surely this is a question worth asking, and deserving attention, and would obtain it, if (as Mr. Nevile very truly observes) public attention could be drawn, for a single week, from imports and exports, the French tariff, and the unequal pressure of the income-tax, to a consideration of the most important of all subjects, the true condition of the National Church.

Owing, he proceeds, to the fatal Act of Uniformity, the Clergy of the Establishment have no alternative but to accept the *whole* of the Book of Common Prayer or *none*. They are not at liberty to vary one iota from its prescribed forms and requirements; or if they do so, they do it, in some dioceses (Oxford and Salisbury for example), with a rope about their neck, which may any day be tightened to their “suspension,” on the information of some neighbouring rural dean, fussy churchwarden, or “aggrieved parishioner;”—this last, very possibly, instigated by some personal antipathy or supposed slight.

The damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, the power of forgiving or retaining sins conferred at the ordination of priests, the unqualified pronouncement at the burial of the dead in all cases,—these, and a few more, must be all equally accepted or rejected *en masse*. If you offend in one point, you are guilty of all. There is no *via media*; no halfway house at which you may pause and take breath, and look behind you as well as before, after once taking priest's orders, and accepting preferment in "the Church."

Mr. Nevile asks, in conclusion, can nothing be done? Is the Legislature content to be for ever silent under such a state of things, and, by silence, to seemingly sanction its existence? or will it at length lend a helping hand, and give some of its countenance to those who have long striven, through evil report and through good report, to bring about a modification of that tyrannical Act—the *fons et origo* of most of the evils under which the Church labours,—not even excepting the grudging payment of a so-called *voluntary* church rate? *

I remain, yours, &c.,

March 20th, 1861.

"INGOLDSBY."

POSTSCRIPT.

THE ASSENT AND CONSENT TO ALL AND EVERYTHING.

Since the above was written Mr. Nevile has come to the resolution to resign his preferments in the Church, amounting in value (according to the Clerical Directory) to above £600 per annum. Now as this great sacrifice of income is an incontestable proof of the sincerity of the writer, it is but

* Such is the present position of this most important matter under the unsatisfactory Act of 1868.

due to him to give here a few more of the arguments upon which he rests his case, and which he has made public in the form of a letter to a provincial paper,—since *repeated* as an *advertisement* in one of the London journals by some other person or persons feeling deeply (as we are there told) on the subjects treated of by the writer.*

Mr. Nevile, accordingly, speaks as follows:—

SIR,—Some time ago I informed the Bishop of Lincoln that it was my intention to resign my Church preferment at the close of this year. In giving my reasons for such a step, *I earnestly wish to draw public attention to the position of many ministers quite as honest as, and far more worthy than, myself.* It is needless to say that their difficulties arise from the state of the present Prayer-book, and the “assent and consent” which all ministers are compelled to give to everything it contains. Twenty-three years ago I published a review of Mr. Newman’s “Lectures on Romanism,” in which there is the following passage:—“When the civil power, either with or without the advice or concurrence of the Church itself, promulgates certain articles of faith, and then renders a subscription to these articles and an agreement upon doctrinal points in them absolutely necessary in the clergy, there is a great deal, even without the use of external force, to secure their adoption, independent of their truth and accordance with Scripture. As a matter of course, all the honours and emoluments of the clerical profession are then to be obtained on those terms alone. The absolute nomination of bishops has been vested in the State, and the State would certainly make choice of those persons who favoured its views, and would support those Articles; *this would influence the whole Church down to the lowest member of it.* A vast proportion of the talent of the country would be enlisted on this side. In the education of youth, which is so much in the hands of the clergy, those theological works would be used which would give what is called an orthodox explanation of these particular points. Early impressions and prejudices would be created, and assist in promoting the continuance of those religious tenets. It is certainly possible that individuals might on further examination disapprove of some of them; but let us consider the situation in which they would be placed, and how far it would operate in discouraging such a disapprobation and the avowal of it. The laity, as a body, seldom devote much time to the investigation of theological

* The Letter appeared in the *Stamford Mercury* and *Daily News*.

doctrines, so it will only be necessary to regard the clergy. *At the time of life when the Church is chosen as a profession, these articles are to be signed, and these tenets are to be embraced, it is impossible that a fair judgment can be arrived at.* If they are conscientiously subscribed at all, it must be to a very great extent upon the credit of the Church for the time being. Many never renew their investigation, and most of those who do, from all these powerful influences, only confirm their previous decision. Paley has said that whoever attacks a flourishing establishment writes with a halter round his neck. Where civil liberty exists, this cannot be positively true, but it may be negatively so. Take the case of a man in the Church, in the enjoyment of a competency in it, having relinquished all prospects in any other profession—his fortune having perhaps been spent on his education, or in the acquisition of his preferment; before he has had time to give his mature consideration, which can only be done at a mature age, to these doctrinal points, he finds that his bread depends upon his forming a certain decision about them. He finds that, if from any cause he cannot conscientiously continue a minister of that Church from which his provision is derived, he must turn out upon the world, with probably a wife and family, who can take no part in the discussion, without an income and without a home. It must be quite obvious that, supposing there should be any doctrinal error contained in our Articles or religious services, it might go on for centuries without correction. The few who discovered such error would have the strongest inducement to keep their discovery to themselves.”

Every objection which has been felt by myself and others against this “assent and consent” required of us, has been confirmed by Dr. Lushington’s judgment. It is now an undisputed fact, that when a young man takes orders in the Established Church, he virtually gives up the right of studying his Bible. He binds himself to accept explications of Scripture upon every conceivable doctrinal subject, and to abide by those explications for the rest of his life, under pain of a punishment in most cases far worse than death. If any doubt arises as to the soundness of his teaching, no appeal to the New Testament is allowed to him. It must be clear to every intelligent person that the Bible is not the “rule of faith in the Established Church.” Dr. Lushington plainly tells us that if a clergyman discovers any error in the Prayer-book he is not at liberty to correct it. Mr. Bouverie’s Bill has been defeated, and ninety-eight gentlemen, amidst loud cheers, have affirmed the principle that if any minister finds himself conscientiously compelled to quit his position in the Church, he should not be allowed to maintain his family in any other profession or calling. I feel assured that this most impolitic and inhuman verdict would be reversed by an overwhelming majority of my fellow-countrymen, if an expression of their sentiments

could be obtained. Individual suffering, however, is not the greatest evil of our present system. It must be most adverse to the advancement of scriptural truth that the wealth and dignities of the richest Church in the world should be held exclusively by men who pledge themselves not to advance one single step beyond the doctrinal statements of the 16th century. *The present Prayer-book represents the exact state of religious knowledge in an age so barbarous and ignorant that poor helpless girls were roasted to death by archbishops, old women were hung as witches by judges on the bench, and 8,000 clergymen were too illiterate to be allowed to preach.* The confused and contradictory mass of theology contained in our Book of Common Prayer has been permitted to supersede the Word of God in our National Church, and it becomes the duty of every man to consider whether or not he is justified in remaining in it. For my own part, I have no choice. I have contracted two obligations which, after more than twenty years' consideration, I find it impossible to reconcile. I pledged myself "to be diligent in reading the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, and out of the same Scriptures to instruct the people committed to my charge." I have endeavoured, however imperfectly, to fulfil that pledge to the best of my ability.

In doing this I have published opinions in direct opposition to some portions of the Prayer-book. No relief can be obtained from the Legislature, and I abandon my position as utterly untenable. To the various anonymous writers in the Church newspapers who have so strongly condemned my conduct, I will only say that their time would have been better bestowed in answering my arguments than in commenting upon my faults. Dr. Arnold says in his "Principles of Church Reform," "The cause of truth and the welfare of mankind have been for ever sacrificed to the paltry triumphs of personal argument. If a party can fairly show that its opponents have been more blamable than itself, it looks upon itself as standing clear in the judgment of posterity and of God." If I maintain that the Ordination Service, the form of Visitation of the Sick, and the Baptismal Services, are in the most essential parts alike opposed to Scripture and reason, and are so considered by a very large majority of the people of this country, it is a poor answer to tell me that I am a traitor for reviling doctrines which I have sworn to defend. But am I a traitor? I gave my assent to the present Prayer-book on the faith of explanations to be found in the works of Paley, Wheatley, and Tomline, which were put into my hands by the Church herself. I signed my contract on the express understanding that actual assent to the Thirty-nine Articles was never expected of me; that in a well-known form of absolution the word "*sins*" meant "*censures*," and therefore in our Church meant "nothing;" that the Athanasian Creed was altogether a forgery, the damnatory clauses very

much to be lamented; and that there was no difference whatever in the condition of baptized and unbaptized infants who die in infancy. The "revival of Church principles" has set aside these latitudinarian explanations, my contract has been fatally changed, and I contend that a court of equity ought to declare it void. In many and great difficulties I have endeavoured to do what appeared to me to be right at the time, and I can tell my censors, whoever they may be, that when a man quits the Church in which he has been born, brought up, and educated, and in which he leaves every relative and friend he has, he must suffer so much that hard indeed must be the heart of that man who would add to his punishment, be his errors what they may.—I remain, your obedient servant,

CHRISTOPHER NEVILE.*

Athenæum, Pall Mall, July 20, 1862.

We made an effort to abridge this letter, but found it difficult to do so with justice to the writer. It became necessary, therefore, to give it entire, or not at all; and we think no apology is due to our readers for our having adopted the former alternative, as the case is here fairly stated of all those clergymen, such as Canon Wodehouse, Cornish, Milne, MacNaught, Pretymen, and many others who have left the Church upon conscientious grounds.

Whether the nation at large is a gainer by retaining a form of words which has the effect of driving intelligent men into this painful course, may well be questioned. But certain it is that the cause of the Dissenters is thereby materially strengthened, while the hearts of many Churchmen are grieved that no attempt is made to modify or repeal the stringent requirements of the Act of 1662.†

It is true we are informed by Dr. Vaughan (the Noneconformist), that in the debate which took place in Parliament, February, 1668, on the religious differences then existing amongst Protestants, a certain Mr. Ratcliffe "wished to see the

* This letter was followed by another to the *Stamford Mercury*, March 10 1863, entitled, "The Established Church v. The Liberation Society," in which the writer sets forth still more in detail the grounds of his resignation.

† This was done to a certain extent by the Subscription Act of 1865, due unquestionably to the agitation of 1858-62.

Act of Uniformity revised, and the 'Assent and Consent' reconsidered ;" and that Sir William Warwick replied, "If I prove that *no man need scruple anything in the Church of England*, why should he be further indulged?"* But we thought, and are still fain to think, that a different style of reply should be required of men living in the latter half of the nineteenth century; and we do not despair of seeing due attention at length paid to this question, when again brought forward in the House of Lords, as we trust it will be, by the champion of the Revisionists in the Session of 1863.

Ingoldsby Rectory, Dec. 16th, 1862.

LETTER CXII.

NEGATIVE THEOLOGY AN ARGUMENT FOR LITURGICAL REVISION.†

"Ille sub hæc: non landis amor, nec gloria cessit
Pulsa metu;—sed enim gelidus tardante senecta
Sanguis hebet, frigentque effetæ in corpore vires."

VIRGIL.

"Then thus the veteran: Still my soul's the same;
Insensible of fear, and fired with martial fame.—
But my chill blood is curdled in my veins,
And scarce the shadow of a man remains."

DRYDEN.

SIR,—It is pleasant to hear a warrior excuse himself from again entering the lists on the plea, that having in his youth "ventured to incur the obloquy and loss of caste awaiting all clerical Church reformers," he is now entitled to some of that *otium cum* (or *sine*) *dignitate* which is due to threescore and odd years."

Mr. Girdlestone, Rector of Kingswinford, and some time Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, feels that his blood is no

* English Nonconformity, by Robert Vaughan. London. 1862. P. 425.

† By the Rev. Charles Girdlestone, M.A. Longmans, 1861.

longer as fervent as it was “*Consule Planco* ;”—that is to say, under William of blessed Reform memory. Reclining, therefore, on his sofa at the delightful bay of Weston-super-Mare, he looks on the expanse of the Bristol Channel agitated by the vernal Equinoctials, and hears the roar of the elements with all the pleasurable sensations of the philosopher in *Lucretius* :—

“*Non quia vexari quenquam est jucunda voluptas,
Sed quibus ipse malis carcas quia cernere suave est.*”

Neither the South-Westerns on the river, nor the breezes in the Church, any longer disturb his repose. His sun is fast sinking to the horizon, and he hopes to end his days in peace, with the delightful consciousness that he had “done what he could” in his youth; and if the evils he then predicted as certain to ensue from the withholding of needful reform are now fast gathering around him, he can honestly say, *It is none of my doing. Absolvi animam meam.*—Let the blame rest on the head of those who refused to be warned in time.*

Nevertheless he cannot satisfy himself to be a silent spectator of the rising flame, the embers of which he formerly assisted to blow.

“It is under a deep sense (he observes) of the momentous interests at stake, that I attempt once more in the evening of my days, from the winter quarters of an invalid, to plead for that temperate but efficient Revision of Church formularies, which I believe to be indispensable alike to their enlarged usefulness and to their permanent security.”

The immediate cause which thus stimulates this sated guest to raise his languid body and support himself once more on his elbow, is the publication of the volume entitled “*Essays*

* Such, alas! are very much the feelings of the Author of these Letters, now in his seventieth year. He, too, has “done what he could” in his day, and haply not laboured altogether in vain. (1878.)

and Reviews," now running into its eighth or ninth edition ; —a volume which has provoked the unprecedented condemnation of the entire Bench of Bishops, followed up recently by the all but unanimous censure of the Lower House of Convocation. This work, says Mr. Girdlestone, owes its origin to the withholding of those timely reforms in our ecclesiastical system which have been advocated at various periods, from 1662 to the present hour, by some of the most thoughtful, earnest, and true sons of the Church, but which have *never been seriously attempted*, with the single exception of the Commission of 1689.

"Our Canons and Articles, our Liturgy and Offices, taken in their natural sense, cannot be fairly reconciled one with another ; and are in some points little in harmony with the sentiments which prevail most largely in our Church.

"Since the time when these documents were drawn up and last revised, the condition of society and the state of Biblical learning have been greatly changed for the better. The controversies to which some of them refer are obsolete. The prejudices which some of them were intended to perpetuate are dying out. The Popish predilections, with a view to which part of them were framed, in the hope of conciliating a generation born and bred in Popery, are now entitled to no such deference.

"Nevertheless all these documents remain unaltered ; and, if our Church rulers are to have their way, unalterable. The minds and habits of the community have been recomposed in a better frame ; but the formularies are stereotyped, and so is the official mind. We will have no change in that which once was good ; at all events, no change *at the present time* ; no change at any time that is or ever will be *present*. So say, with some few illustrious exceptions, those who could most effectually preserve whilst they reform. So, too, have lately said some thousands of Church ministers, aiding and abetting the Episcopal opponents of Revision. And thus the law of Articles, Canons, Offices, Liturgy, and Rubrics, remains unchanged in any jot or tittle."*

* "Negative Theology, an argument for," &c., pp. 8-9.—Mr. Froude well observes, "If medicine had been regulated three hundred years ago by Act of Parliament, if there had been thirty-nine Articles of Physic, and every licensed practitioner had been compelled under pains and penalties to compound his drugs by the prescriptions of Henry VIII.'s physician,

Now we ask our readers, is not this statement substantially true? and if true, is it *right* that such should be the case? Is it wise? Is it a course likely to be beneficial to the Church in the long run? Is it not, on the contrary, eminently calculated to add strength to her enemies, and to give a colourable pretext to those *other* grounds of secession, which have their root in deeper motives for hostility, and owe little or nothing to any real religious feeling? Hear one of the Essayists: and though, to many, his language may sound strange, and to others strong, it is not altogether devoid of truth.

“In the present day a godless orthodoxy threatens, as in the fifteenth century, to *extinguish religious thought altogether*; and nothing is allowed in the Church of England but the formulæ of past thinkings, which have long lost all sense of any kind.”*

The fact is undeniable, that by requiring men at the age of twenty-three, just fresh from studies of a totally different character, to subscribe to Articles and Canons embracing a vast range of thought upon subjects of the most abstruse nature, we induce and almost compel a laxity of morals highly prejudicial to the clerical profession,† and tending to react upon those who shall be placed under such spiritual guidance. Practical unbelief in some cases, indifference in others, in most (no doubt) a blind acquiescence in “the formulæ of past

Dr. Butts, it is easy to conjecture in what state of health the people of this country would at present be found.” (“Plea for the free discussion of theological difficulties.” *Fraser's Magazine*, 1863.)

* Mark Pattison, “Essays and Reviews,” p. 297.

† Something of this kind was foretold at the Savoy Conference, 1661: “If your ministers (say the remonstrants) are to be men so little competent to their office that you dare not allow them to pray, in the name of everything consistent do not allow them to preach. If the existing clergy be not men so feeble as really to need that everything in this manner be *done for them*, such a course of proceeding will surely create an order of men who will be of that low and mechanical description.”—VAUGHAN'S *Nonconformity*, chap. vi., p. 287. This deponent sayeth true.

thinkings," is the natural result of such a system. Hence the variety of opinions found to prevail among the clergy when they arrive at a maturer age, notwithstanding they have all given, at some time or other, their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything in the Book of Common Prayer. We find within the same pale those all but lapsing into Romanism, yet accepting in some sense the Thirty-nine Articles.* We find others, who have passed the meshes of the same compliant net, using our Baptismal Services, while utterly repudiating the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. We find ministers compelled to consign to the grave notorious drunkards, profane swearers, Sabbath-breakers, and avowed infidels, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," while at another part of the same office they have no alternative but to thank God "that it hath pleased him to *take unto himself the soul* of this their dear brother here departed." †

"A Church (says Mr. Girdlestone) which can by compromise, and by acquiescing in lax interpretation, so far nullify its documents, as to retain at once within its pale a Philpotts and a Gorham, a Ditcher and a Denison, after full exposure of their desperate antagonism, will never be permitted, by an impartial and Epicurean state, to exclude Negative Theologians who are *willing to conform*." (P. 13.)

The extent to which subscription to formulæ of any kind should be enforced is a grave and intricate question, likely to be seriously considered before long by the ruling powers; ‡

* On this head it would be well to consult a treatise by the late learned W. E. Jelf, B.D., on "Ritualism, Romanism, and the English Reformation": (Longmans, 1876); also "Apology on behalf of the Evangelical Movement," by the Rev. B. W. Savile, M.A. (Longmans, 1876).

† See before, Letter *ent.*, p. 192, on the Burial Service.

‡ The Bishop of London (Tait) observes in his Charge of Dec., 1862, "Even now, in spite of all temporary alarm as to unsound opinions, I would relax rather than tighten the bonds of the declaration which the law requires

but it seems a perfect farce to exact, as is now done, such subscription, and then *practically to allow it to remain a dead letter*. Surely the alternative were better, to dispense altogether with the form, than thus to hear on all hands charges and recriminations of dishonesty bandied between those who have mutually complied with it. Nothing can be worse than this; and it is the fruit of long growth from this tree. "It is a thing (says Hilary) equally deplorable and dangerous that there are at present as many creeds as there are opinions among men. We make creeds arbitrarily, and we *explain them as arbitrarily*. As there is but one faith, so there is but one God, one Lord, and one Baptism. We renounce this *one faith* when we make so many creeds. And *that diversity is the reason why we have no true faith among us.*"*

Let the Bishops, who have joined with one voice in condemning the "Essays and Reviews," lay this sentence to heart, and consider whether the continued resistance to Revision of our formulæ be not answerable for much of the Neology now abroad. Also whether the exclusiveness of our ecclesiastical polity is or is not as much *positively* to blame, as the Essayists may be *negatively*. It is stated by Neal that if the alterations in the Prayer-book, recommended by the Commissioners of 1689, had been adopted, it would in all probability have brought in three parts out of four of the Dissenters.† That it would have materially *checked* the exodus, and prevented much of that geometric progress of Dissent which has since taken place, it is impossible to deny.

Our limits preclude us from making more extracts from Mr. Girdlestone's tract. The writer is possessed of talents and moral courage equally creditable to his head and heart;

to be made at ordination. Dealing with the difficulties of an inquisitive age, the generous confiding policy is the most Christian."

* Locke's Works, Vol. II., p. 426.

† History of the Puritans, Vol. IV., p. 618. "Essays and Reviews," p. 197.

but which qualities, we fear, while they command our admiration, will (as is too frequently the case in the profession to which he belongs) meet with no other reward.

I remain, yours, &c.,

March 30, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above was written, Mr. Girdlestone has contributed two more papers to the cause of Revision, the one entitled “Black Bartholomew’s Day, or how shall we best commemorate the Bicentenary of the Act of Uniformity?”—the other, a Letter to a Member of Parliament, which, though printed for private distribution, has been extensively circulated, and well sustains the author’s credit. From the former of these tracts suffice it to quote the following:—

“Never had the Church of England such an opportunity as that which this year (1862) presents of expressing regret for the past, by repealing or amending the objectionable clauses in the Act of Uniformity. On no day could a liberal amendment of that Act, involving a judicious adaptation of the formularies of the Church to the wants of the present generation, come into effect with half so good a grace, or so great a probability of conciliating opponents, as on August 24, 1862. Nor have Dissenters and Dissenting communities ever had a call more urgent to exercise Christian forbearance, by concurring in any well-devised measure for blotting out from the statute-book old occasions of offence; and, by joining with those from whom they differ, to bury in mutual oblivion wrongs which, however unjustifiable, were surely not on either side unprovoked.”*

From the latter, this:—

“I am one of many who think that this lamentable state of things is greatly owing to the Act of Uniformity; in these two respects:—first, that it requires such very precise and plenary assent to everything in the Prayer-book, as last revised at a time of vehement party spirit; secondly, that in the book thus prescribed certain points are set

* “Black Bartholomew’s Day.” By Rev. C. Girdlestone, 1862: p. 7.

forth, and defined, in terms other and more precise and exclusive than are warranted by the volume of Holy Writ, which the Church itself upholds as the sole ultimate standard of truth. Obviously the remedies are :—

First, make the form of assent less stringent.

Secondly, remove, from the things to be assented to, such as are objectionable.”*

LETTER CXIII.

THE CHURCH AND THE NONCONFORMISTS OF 1662.†

“Which was the greater offender, Nebuchadnezzar who enjoined obedience, or Daniel who refused it?”—VAUGHAN’S *Nonconformity*, p. 236.

SIR,—One striking proof of the progress made of late in the Revision agitation is the delivery of public Lectures in several of the larger towns. We alluded to this in our annual Retrospect for the year 1860,‡ and we now proceed to notice a lecture, published by its author, the Rev. D. Mountfield, one of the most persevering and by no means least intelligent advocates of the cause of Revision.

We have seldom met with a work comprising so much in so small a compass. We have here, in about a hundred pages, history, anecdote, argument, and sound reasoning all brought to bear closely upon the matter in hand, and presented to the reader in a popular and attractive style. Of course it is the old tale of religious persecution, with which we are but too well acquainted already ; but it has been truly said,—

“Difficile est proprie *communia* dicere;”—

and the praise of our author lies in this, that he has given to

* “Revision of the Liturgy, &c.” By Rev. C. Girdlestone; Feb. 1862.

† An Account of the Expulsion of the Puritans, &c. By the Rev. D. Mountfield, M.A. London: Kent and Co. 1861.

‡ See Letter CVII., p. 216.

these common-places all the point and edge of novelty by his unique manner of telling them.

Taking for his starting-point the expulsion of the 2,000* beneficed clergymen on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, Mr. Mountfield carries us rapidly through the succession of misery which befell those men, reminding one of the martyrs of old, who "wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, destitute, afflicted, tormented:" and all for what?—Why, *principally* because, having been, *as they believed*, scripturally ordained in France and Holland, they refused to be *re-ordained* under the episcopal form in England, thereby in a manner nullifying all their previous ministerial acts.

They were further required, by the circumstances under which this revengeful Act was passed, to give on one fixed day their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything in a book which some of them had not as yet seen,† few of them had had time fully to consider, but which they well knew had been carefully so constructed as to make their conformity in certain cases impossible.‡

* The largest number of Nonconformists said to have been ejected by the Act of 1662, is 2,196: but they are usually spoken of in round numbers as 2,000. See Stoughton's "Church and State Two Hundred Years Ago." London: Jackson and Walford, 1862; p. 370.

† "It was provided by the Act, that its penalty should not be enforced where conformity by the prescribed day had been *prevented by lawful impediment*, the decision on any plea of that nature being left to the Ordinary of the place. It is probable that any clergyman pleading for delay on the ground that he *had not seen the book at all*, or had not been a reasonable time in possession of it, would have been heard."—VAUGHAN'S *Nonconformity*, B. II., ch. xi., p. 378.

‡ "The amendments of the Lords, on the Act of Uniformity, as sent up by the Commons, were considerable, and mostly of a kind to make the Act still more oppressive. The form of subscription to the Prayer-book was no longer a *consent* merely to *use* it, but an *assent* to all that it contained."—VAUGHAN, B. II., ch. viii. The Bishop of London (Tait), speaking of the stringency of the declarations required of candidates for Holy Orders, observes, "Looking back to history, we learn that their minuteness was devised *for the express purpose of driving out of the Church* many persons whom we should

Among the persons of whom the nation at that time was not worthy, are found Baxter, Calamy, Howe, Philip Henry, Bates, Manton, Heywood, Flavel, Charnock, Jacomb, Newcomen, Spurstow, Allein, Matthew Poole, Gouge, Samuel Clarke, and others, whose memory will survive when that of their persecutors is forgotten, except for the part they took in thus throwing a stumbling-block in the way of men more learned and righteous than themselves. Among these latter stands conspicuous Sheldon's wretched tool, Dr. Samuel Parker, whom, like the cruel Jeffreys, fame has marked with an undying celebrity for his share in this blotted leaf of our Church's history.

Mr. Mountfield's pages will here be read with painful interest; as also where he details the futile attempts which have since been made at various times to undo in whole or part the fatal effects of the Act of 1662. Our more pleasing task is to call attention to the efforts now making, *melioribus auspiciis*, to accomplish the same object. Lord Ebury, to whom Mr. Mountfield with great propriety dedicates his interesting volume, invites the Legislature to take steps for removing as far as possible those barriers to a wise comprehension which still exist, as they have existed ever since the passing of the Act.

It is no argument to say that some of these barriers have practically gone into desuetude, and that many of them are habitually disregarded by those who are Conformists to all outward appearance, while they inwardly scruple at many of the expressions to which they have given their unfeigned assent and consent. There the expressions are;—and so long as they are there, so long will persons be found of the mind of the martyrs of 1662, who cannot be brought to view sub-

be very glad now-a-days, under the prevalence of a better spirit, and with wiser views of the Church's comprehensiveness, to retain and employ as its ministers."—*Times' report of the Bishop of London's Charge*, Dec. 3, 1862.

scription in this accommodating light. It is vain to tell such persons, as Bishop Morley did the Puritan of his day, "You must not philosophise upon the words Assent and Consent;—no more is intended by them than that you will *read the book*, and if you do so I will admit you to a living."* The misfortune is, these are just the men who cannot help "philosophising;"—their consciences are of that peculiar cast that *will* call a spade a spade, and have no idea of swearing black is white; men, in short, who are too thin skinned to adopt Bishop Tait's convenient theory, of "getting over their scruples as well as they can."†

According to the *Edinburgh Review*, in a somewhat disingenuous article on the Revision question in its number for last quarter, "Such adhesion as is demanded from English clergymen to all and everything which lies between the boards of the Prayer-book is a thing *simply impossible* to a consistent mind."‡ Yet this is the adhesion still exacted by the law, and expected by the bishops of all candidates for institution to a benefice.

This anomaly in legislation is what Lord Ebury and his band of honest reformers, of whom Mr. Mountfield is one, have been long seeking to remove, and we trust and believe they will not altogether seek in vain.

I remain, yours, &c.,

April 28, 1861.

"INGOLDSBY."

P.S.—Mr. Mountfield has since published another very

* Nonconformists' Memorial, Vol. II., p. 24. King Charles II., in his declaration from Worcester House, expressed himself as willing that "the subscription required upon entering upon a benefice should be left *optional* to those who had scruples concerning it, till measures could be taken for a Revision of the Prayer-book."—VAUGHAN'S *Nonconformity*, B. II., ch. iv., p. 248.

† See Letter xcii., p. 128.

‡ *Edinburgh Review* for Jan. 1861, No. ccxxix.

able work on this subject, entitled "Two Hundred Years Ago,"* which has already gone into a second edition, and is deserving of being extensively circulated, as a true and vivid account of the Ejection of the Puritans, and the efforts made to restore them.

LETTER CXIV.

DUBLIN ASSOCIATION FOR REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

"He was particularly curious with regard to the construction of clocks and watches; and having found, after repeated trials, that he could not bring any two of them to go exactly alike, he reflected, it is said, with a mixture of surprise as well as regret on his own folly, in having bestowed so much time and labour on the more vain attempt of bringing mankind to a precise uniformity and sentiment concerning the profound and mysterious doctrines of religion."—ROBERTSON'S *Charles V.*, B. xii., p. 382.

SIR,—It is not amongst the least significant proofs of the interest excited by the Revision movement, that it has attracted in no inconsiderable degree the attention of the Irish branch of the Church.† This fact is sufficiently attested by several recent Episcopal Charges on the other side of the channel,—in particular those of the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately), and the Bishop of Limerick (Griffin), Cork (Fitzgerald), Derry and Raphoe (Higgin),—to which may be added more than one article in the *Dublin University Magazine*, and several letters and other communications in various Irish papers.‡

* London: Kent and Co., Paternoster Row; Sandford, Shrewsbury; 1862.

† The movement, then newly begun, has since culminated in the production of a Revised Book of Common Prayer for that portion of the kingdom.

‡ The subject has also not escaped the notice of our German neighbours: a very able *résumé* of the agitation, from its commencement up to 1862, having been lately published in that country, entitled, "The Present Movement in the English Church for an Alteration of the Liturgy," by H. Messner, Professor of Divinity, Berlin; 1862.

The chief feature, however, which is noticeable in the sister country, as connected with this subject, is the publication of certain Amendments on the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Committee of the Dublin Association, assisted by several of the clergy and laity in England.* This is a bold step; as experience shows that it is much easier for men to differ than to agree upon the doctrine of the Prayer-book, and the professed object of this tract of but four-and-twenty pages is to exhibit the book in such a form that all men may be able to accept it.

“The Spaniard, when the lust of sway
Had lost its quickening spell,
Cast crowns for rosaries away,
An empire for a cell;
A strict accountant of his beads,
A subtle disputant on Creeds,
His dotage trifled well:”—

but we do not learn that he succeeded in making two watches go together for four-and-twenty hours; and it is quite certain he had previously failed in his mad attempt at accomplishing unity of religious opinion throughout the extent of his vast dominions.†

The Irishman, however, may hit where the Spaniard missed. Let us see how he has set about it. No pains, we are told, have been spared. An immense amount of labour has been encountered, and no small expense incurred, in circulating draft after draft of the proposed amendments amongst the clergy and laity of both kingdoms.

But then, one thing strikes us forcibly, as marking the character of the Revision here contemplated; and which leads us to suspect that the inquiries have been after all somewhat one-sided—that is to say, that counsel has been taken chiefly,

* London: Hamilton and Adams, 33, Paternoster Row. 1861.

† See Wylie's History of Protestantism. Cassell and Co., London, 1878.

if not exclusively, of those who are known *à priori* to belong to a particular section in the Church. This, we confess, is not our idea of arriving at unity in religious thought. And though we willingly admit that there are many, very many, of the amendments proposed in this tract which we think improvements, and should gladly see adopted, we cannot by any means say so of all, and we still, therefore, wait the publication of some volume of a more comprehensive character, and therefore more likely to be generally popular. The chief authorities here cited are Messrs. Fisher and Gell,—worthy men in their generation,—but still human—and, as such, fallible as other men. We see no symptoms of any opinion whatever having been taken of high or even moderate Churchmen.

The great object of the work, says the preface, has been to bring the language of the Prayer-book, in its plain and obvious meaning, into harmony with Scriptural truth, so that nothing shall be asserted as a fact, or set forth as a doctrine to be received, that cannot be proved by Scripture; and thus to remove all just cause of exception on the part of either members of the Church or of pious Nonconformists,—thereby opening the way for the latter to join our communion. The suggested amendments are accordingly based upon, and are assumed to be in harmony with, two great principles; the one, laid down in the 6th Article, that “whatsoever is not read in the Scriptures, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required that it should be believed as an article of faith;”—the other, affirmed by the Privy Council in the Gorham case, that “regeneration by the Holy Spirit may take place *before, at, or after* baptism.”

It is clear from the above that the prominent feature in the tract is the baptismal question, the object being to “purify” the Church’s practice and theory in this respect. How far the authors have succeeded in establishing their own

position on the *débris* of that of the Church, we must leave others to judge. But there can be no doubt this document will prove a valuable instrument in the hand of any body of Commissioners who may be constitutionally appointed to the task of a Revision of the Prayer-book, as saving them much trouble in ascertaining the views held by one earnest section of the Church, and the method they suppose calculated to carry them out.

I remain, yours, &c.,

May 16, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXV.

CHURCH QUESTIONS. BY THE REV. C. ROBINSON, LL.D.*

“Conamur tenues grandia.”—HORACE.

SIR,—Such is the humble motto which the author of “Church Questions” appropriates to himself and his little book; and we cannot do better than adopt the same ourselves on the present occasion.

It is no light matter for a plain country Parson to take in hand the vast subject of Church Reform,—and Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons have small inducement to do so. “We all know”—says Burke, in his speech on the Feathers’ Tavern Petition of Feb. 1772,—“We all know that those who loll at their ease in high dignities, whether of the Church or of the State, are commonly averse to all reformation. It is hard to persuade them that there can be anything amiss in Establishments which, by feeling experience, they find to be so very comfortable.”†

Dr. Robinson is not in this position. He is the hard-working incumbent, and has been for the last ten years, of a

* “Church Questions,” Second Series. By the Rev. C. Robinson, LL.D., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Blackburn. London: Hatchard. 1861.

† Burke’s Works, Vol. x., p. 4. Rivingtons, 1812.

parish in the manufacturing districts, whose population is returned as 3,433, but we believe is nearer 5,000 : while the gross income is in the usual inverse ratio of but £190 per annum.* No wonder the Doctor describes himself as *tenuis*. We never heard of any one getting fat under such circumstances. He is, notwithstanding, the author of many useful tracts, among which this Second Series of "Church Questions" is well worthy of being reckoned.

It treats, *inter alia*, of Easter dues, Church-rates, an increased Episcopate, and *Revision of the Prayer-book*. To this last we shall confine ourselves, as bearing on the subject of our previous letters.

Dr. Robinson considers, that as Lord Ebury has not as yet been able to prevail on the House of Lords to listen favourably to his proposal for a Royal Commission, the next thing to be done is, to cast about for some *other* method of accomplishing the same end ; in fact, to take the citadel by sap and mine, if the enemy cannot be ejected by storm. All, in short, that is wanted is, to get the thing done. The whole difficulty lies in ascertaining the best way of doing it.†

The author of the Life of Laud tells us, that to the reiterated complaints of the Puritans, Archbishop Abbot's reply was, "Yield ; and they will be pleased at last." Archbishop Laud's maxim, on the other hand, was, "Resolve ; for there is no end of yielding."—Have any of my readers in

* It was with a view to correct anomalies like this in our parochial system, that Mr. H. D. Seymour obtained a Committee of Inquiry into the working of the Ecclesiastical Commission, a first report of which was published by order of the House of Commons in the Session of 1862.

† See a tract entitled, "Who will take the first step ?" By the Hon. and Rev. Edward V. Blich. Wertheim ; 1863. The object of the writer being to show that the *laity* must take the initiative, the clergy being precluded by their Assent and Consent from making any material demonstration in favour of a Revision of the Prayer-book. This gentleman has (like the Rev. Christopher Nevile and Canon Wodehouse) felt bound to resign valuable Church preferment on conscientious grounds : 1878.

their scrap-books a caricature published about thirty years ago, headed, "Let me be loved—Let me be feared"—representing under one face, with a movable front, the respective persons of King William the Fourth and the Duke of Wellington; and bearing the appropriate motto, Look on this picture and on that?—Exactly so is it now with the two parties in the Church, of the movement and non-movement factions. Laud and Wellington are the patron saints of the one; Abbot and King William of the other. Those would be feared; these would be loved. The one would deter; the other would invite.

The former, by the mere force of *sic volo, sic jubeo*, would still compel the same literal adherence to the Act of Uniformity which drove 2,000 ministers from the Church in 1662. The latter would endeavour, by a less rigorous form of subscription, the modification of some half-score phrases in our Liturgy, greater rubrical elasticity and simplicity, with a mild spirit of Christian comprehension, to bring back to the fold the dispersion of Israel, and hold them there by bonds of love, mutual forbearance, and above all things Charity.

The Abbot of this party is the noble lord who has twice already appeared before Parliament as their advocate. His followers, it is true, are more honest than numerous, more resolute and devoted than conspicuous for rank or position in the Church. But having the testimony of an approving conscience, they are well able to bear the amount of obloquy and personal insult to which they have been subjected, and to look elsewhere for their reward than to the favour of Prime Ministers or the smiles and patronage of the heads of the Church.

The Laud of the opposing faction is (as is well known,) Bishop Wilberforce. His rank and file show strongest in the Lower House of Convocation, though he is not without support among the Peers and Prelates of the land. These men act on the principle enunciated by Burke, in the speech

above referred to, that the Church, being a "Voluntary Society," is at perfect liberty to exclude from her membership any one she thinks fit, or to oppose the entrance of any upon such conditions as she thinks proper. Such are the principles upon which exist, according to this theorist, "Nobility, Royalty, and Priesthood; all of which you may limit to birth; *you might prescribe even shape and stature.* The Jewish priesthood was hereditary. Founders' kinsmen have a preference in the election of fellows in some colleges of our Universities; the qualifications at All Souls are, that they should be—*optime nati, bene vestiti, mediocriter docti.*"*

Of the nativity and vesture of the Bishop of Oxford's fellows we know little; but of their doctrine, unfortunately, we know but too much,—and, alas! "moderation" forms no part of it. They seem to regard with painful indifference the fact that at least one-half of the population of this mighty empire is ranked under one denomination or other of Dissent, or under no denomination at all; while, for their own parts, they are content that "the voice of the Church" should (as on a late occasion) be heard through some eight or ten members of the Upper, and some two dozen of the Lower House of Convocation.†

Dr. Robinson's plan is simple, and only defective in being what the Dean of Norwich calls so very "homœopathic."‡

* Burke's Works, Vol. x., p. 16. Rivingtons, 1812.

† On the occasion of the Dean of Norwich's motion for a Revision of the Prayer-book, the Lower House of Convocation consisted of the following:—Archdeacon Bickersteth, in the absence of the Dean of Bristol (Elliot), presiding as Prolocutor; the Dean of Norwich (Pellw), Archdeacons Denison, Randall, Hone, Hale, and Moore; Canons Woodgate, Wordsworth, and Mills; Dr. Jeff, Dr. Williams; the Revs. Sir H. Thompson, Sir J. Prevost, Joyce, Burton, Fendall, J. Jebb, Massingberd, A. Oxenden, Seymour, Acland, Mayow, Kennaway, and Gillett;—being *twelve official*, and *thirteen delegated members*.—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*, April 9, 1861; p. 263.

‡ See Speech on the Revision of the Prayer-book, by the Hon. and Very Rev. G. Pellw, Dean of Norwich, March, 1861. Hatchard.

He sketches out twelve methods of relaxation in our formulæ, all of which he thinks might be carried into execution without altering the present Prayer-book. We do not like these makeshifts; and would far rather see the whole volume subjected to the careful scrutiny of an impartially selected Commission.

Dr. Robinson is content to dance attendance upon Convocation. We confess that we are not. Life is not long enough for reforms carried out (or *not* carried out) at the rate of one Canon in ten years. We had rather look to Parliament, at any rate to take the initiative in this weighty but most necessary matter. If it do not, we really know not where else to look; and we see nothing before us but a dark and dreary prospect for the Church.* Its day of grace will have passed and gone; and men will for the future either "let it alone," as beyond the hope of internal amendment, or they will in some evil day rise up in anger against it and overthrow it.†

I remain, yours, &c.,

June 22nd, 1861.

"INGOLDSBY."

* Something of this sort took place in the State Revolution of 1640—60. At least thus writes the able author of "English Nonconformity:"—

"Thomas May, the thoughtful historian of the Long Parliament, was a close observer of the feeling and language of men in those days concerning the tendencies of public affairs. He relates that the serious and just men of England, who derived no emolument from the oppressions then so common, could not look to the future without foreboding. Affairs having gone so far in a wrong track, either a free nation, it was said, was about to become enslaved in person and property for ever, or a struggle to prevent that calamity would be such that all ranks were likely to groan under them."—VAUGHAN'S *Nonconformity*, Book I., Chap. iv., p. 94.

† "Thus ever bigotry resists reform,

Inviting ruin. She hears not that hum

Over the moral ocean;—that alarm

Like the far roll of a vast muffled drum—

Throes, sighs, and sobs of the deep-gathering storm,

Portentous voicings, which will not be dumb,

Though she keep adder-deaf till the crash come."

Ravenecross, a Poem. (See pp. 187, 192.)

LETTER CXVI.

THE DEAN OF NORWICH IN CONVOCATION.

"There never was anything by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted; as, among other things, it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called Divine Service."—*Preface to the First Prayer-book of Edward VI.*

SIR,—The above is the motto attached by the Dean of Norwich to his recently published speech on the Revision of the Liturgy;* and though originally adopted by the compilers of our Liturgy three hundred years ago, it has not to this hour lost its force; indeed it may be said, like fame, to have gathered strength by moving,—for surely, if applicable then, it is not less applicable now.

We are glad that the Dean has had the moral courage to publish this speech. It will take its place by the side of Lord Ebury's,† and be read by generations yet unborn, who will wonder, and not without reason, how so much good sense, moderation, and sound argument could possibly have fallen ineffectively on the ears of men living in the middle of the nineteenth century. Yet so it is. We can only regret that the speeches of the Dean's opponents are not in like manner set forth in a more permanent form than that in which they are now exhibited in the pages of the *Guardian*,

* Substance of a Speech delivered in the Lower House of Convocation, March 14, 1861, on introducing a motion recommending certain modifications of the Liturgy; to which are added a few remarks in answer to the objections made on that occasion. By the Hon. and Very Rev. George Pellow, D.D., Dean of Norwich. London: Hatchard. 1861.

† It will be deeply to be regretted if Lord Ebury does not respond, however tardily, to the oft-repeated wishes of his friends, that he would republish his three speeches in a collective form, with notes and additions. (1878.)

if it were but to gratify the curiosity of our great grandchildren, who will marvel at the line of argument that could have had sufficient weight to overthrow or set aside the Dean's position.

The only fault we find with the Dean's speech is, that it asks for too little. But seeing even that little was denied him, we suppose he measured his demands by the prospect of success. This is not always the wisest plan. Dealers in fish, flesh, or fowl, are apt to leave somewhat to abate in price to the covetousness of a stingy customer; and perhaps, if the Dean, having respect to the well-known character of his audience, had been a little more exigent, he might have obtained all he now asks. As it is, he asked for but little; and for his pains—has got nothing, and at this rate *will* get nothing.

Will it be believed by future ages that upon the Dean's request that the Calendar should be reviewed, repetitions in the service removed, the Psalter re-arranged, and but one Creed read at each service, a kind of Sacheverell hue and cry of "The Church in danger" was instantly set up by certain Proctors and Archdeacons in Convocation, while scarce a voice was heard in support of such obvious and innocent improvements on our present Book of Common Prayer? In metaphorical language the Dean's humble suggestions went no further than this, that after the lapse of 200 years, it might be advisable to examine the walls of the ecclesiastical edifice, to point the few places where time and the weather had raked out the mortar, and to put in new bricks in the room of those that had crumbled away. Yet even this homœopathic measure of reform met with no favour in the eyes of clerical legislators in the Church parliament. What if Messrs. Fisher and Gell had propounded to them *their nostrums* for purifying the Liturgy? What if Lord Ebury had presumed to insinuate that it would have fared none

the worse with the Church if a Havelock or a Livingstone had been included within her pale? Why, we should have seen "each particular hair stand on end" upon the heads of Archdeacon Denison and the Rev. Frank Massingberd* "like quills upon the fretful porcupine."

We have no intention of following these worthies through all the mazes of their fears, doubts, and evil anticipations suggested by the Dean's monstrous proposition. They are briefly, quietly, and to our mind most satisfactorily replied to by the Dean himself in a postscript to his published speech. Our present purpose is simply to notice the manner in which the Dean proceeds to move certain resolutions, which had stood in his name on the boards of Convocation for the last six or seven years. We thought it had been longer; but six or seven years is no small slice out of the limited span allotted to active human life; and in the Dean's particular case, seeing that he is considerably past the meridian of his days, is of very serious moment. The Dean, with bitter irony, commences by congratulating his hearers on the progress they have made, during a part of this and the last session of Convocation, in relaxing a Canon, the stringency of which had long been found to act injuriously! This is the only fruit the speaker is able to refer to as resulting from, we believe, ten years' session of Convocation! At this rate, he observes, it would take one hundred and forty years to repeal the whole body of one hundred and forty Canons. We should have said, *one thousand four hundred* years. But seeing that even *one Canon is not yet repealed*, nor (as far as we can see) likely to be so, the difference between 140, or 1400, and infinity, is so immaterial, that it may be fairly sunk in our calculations.

* See more of this "fretful" gentleman: Vol. I., Letter XLVIII., p. 309: Vol. II., Letter LXXXIII., p. 75.

The Dean, however, is encouraged ; and reporting progress, asks leave to sit again. He suggests,

That the Upper House of Convocation be respectfully invited to concur with the Lower in a humble Petition to her Majesty the Queen, that she will be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission, composed of ecclesiastical persons, to consider whether the Book of Common Prayer may not be better adapted to the present exigencies of the Church.

1st. By some modification of the Rubric, so as to dispense with certain repetitions which occur in the public services as at present used.

2ndly. By enlarging, and in some cases altering, the Table of Appointed Lessons ; and especially assigning different Lessons for the Afternoon and Evening Services.

3rdly. By a re-arrangement of the Psalter.

4thly. By the use of but one Creed at each public Service, and *that one* the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, except on Trinity Sunday, when that of St. Athanasius *may be read*.

5thly. By allowing the officiating minister, at his discretion, to transfer the Litany, or that portion of the Communion Service which is usually read on Sundays, from the Morning to the Afternoon or Evening Services.

6thly. By the addition of certain Prayers or Services for seasons of humiliation or thanksgiving ; for a blessing on our Home and Foreign Missions ; for prisoners, and for various other special occasions. The Commission to be strictly required to confine its deliberations to the above points, and to such others as may be specially submitted to it by the Queen's authority ; and on no account to interfere with the doctrines of the Church, as contained in her Articles, Canons, and Liturgy.

Such is the Dean's simple bill of fare ; such only the magic he would use. The arguments by which he supports *seriatim* the several clauses of his modest little bill are well and mildly put. The *suaviter in modo* was never more forcibly illustrated. He outdoes here even Lord Ebury himself, whose forte it is to speak very swords in words smoother than oil. We shall not attempt to abridge the Dean's speech. It is *multum in parvo* ; and, as far as it goes, says everything that is to be said in support of his propositions.

However, he did not succeed in opening the ears of the opposing adders. The siren's voice pleaded in vain. The

result of the ensuing debate—the utmost the charmer could succeed in establishing—was, that the motion should be withdrawn ; to be resumed doubtless on the Greek kalends. Meanwhile, in all the spirit of an honest friend, we warn members of Convocation to beware what they are about. It is just the tale of Gatton and Old Sarum over again. Remember the Iron Duke in 1830 ! If the House of Commons take the matter up,—and Lord Ebury wearies of addressing for ever the dull benches of the Lords,—Tarquin's bargain with the Sibyl will be a trifle to the terms which will then be offered for the acceptance (or *rejection* if they please—for it will be then a matter of perfect indifference *which* it is—) of the two Houses of Convocation.

I remain, Sir, yours, &c.,

July 13, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXVII.

LORD EBURY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, JULY 22, 1861.

“Though late in vain assail'd,
The spear may enter where the arrow fail'd.”

POPE'S *Homer*.

SIR,—There are one or two features in the short discussion raised last week in the House of Lords, upon Lord Ebury's presenting some petitions in favour of a Revision of the Liturgy, which it is material to notice at this stage of the history of that long-agitated question.

In the first place, though this was his lordship's third, we were happy to hear from his own lips he by no means intends it to be his last, time of asking.

Secondly, it is noticeable that so far from relaxing in his terms, in consequence of his hitherto apparent failures, he (Sibylline fashion) has decidedly advanced them.

It is true the Bishop of London (Tait) observed that “he

was glad the noble lord had *confined himself* to the question of subscription ;”—but any one who considers all that that question implies, will see at a glance that it involves in fact far more radical results than any yet aimed at by Lord Ebury or his supporters.

Two years ago, when the noble lord hinted at the desirableness of making such alterations in our formulæ as might admit a Havelock or a Livingstone within the pale of the Establishment, it will be remembered with what horror the suggestion was entertained by a certain prelate who followed in the debate.* What would that individual, who by-the-by (contrary to his wont) appears to have been absent from the debate the other night,—what would he have said on hearing the following words from Lord Ebury’s lips?—

“It will be my duty next year (1862) to ask your lordships to assent to a bill to relax the terms of subscription, which have been so severely reprobated by some of the brightest ornaments of our Church ; and to substitute in their stead something more consonant with the conciliatory spirit and Christianity of our age.”

This principle, carried to its *possible* limits, would clearly make way for the admission of,—not Baptists only and Independents, which two denominations of Christians, we believe, claim the names of Havelock and Livingstone respectively,—but Quakers, Wesleyans, Primitive Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics of course,—any one, in short, except Jews, Turks, and Infidels. We do not say that Lord Ebury exactly means all this ; but we are sure he will find much difficulty in drawing his line when once the Rubicon of Subscription is fairly crossed.

We cannot say we are surprised at the course now taken by the noble lord. It is, on the contrary, what our past Letters

* See Vol. I., Letters ix., xiii., xiv.

will prove we have long ago predicted as the inevitable result of an obstinate resistance to moderate and reasonable demands. Keep the Prayer-book word for word, syllable for syllable, rubric for rubric, as it was in 1662, "and it must follow, as the night the day," that rigid subscription to it cannot be enforced under the growing intelligence of the age we live in. The Castle of Indolence is now about to be stormed. The trumpet to parley has long blown in vain, and is henceforth silent for ever. The "No surrender" of the self-confident occupants has provoked a counter cry of "Down with it, down with it, even to the ground," from the exasperated assailants. The Bishop of Oxford and Archdeacon Denison proclaim with a voice of thunder "the Prayer-book shall not be touched;" Lord Ebury, with provoking imperturbability, replies, "Away, then, with subscription."

Who can doubt which party is most to blame in this new, and to a certain extent hazardous, phasis of the war?—The noble lord observed, in his late remarks before the House, that "he had waited patiently to the very last week of the Session in hopes that the initiative in this matter would be taken by the ecclesiastical element in our Legislature." But in vain did he hope; in vain did he look and listen; in vain have the friends to the cause searched the journals of the House and the records of Convocation; not a vestige appears of anything said or done or intended to be done by way of relaxation or amendment. On the contrary, they find that when in the present year a most trifling proposition for relief was made in the latter place by the Dean of Norwich, seconded by one of the Proctors for the Diocese of Canterbury,* it met with so small an amount of support, and encountered such a storm of opposition, as evidently to deter any one from repeating the experiment before the same tribunal.

* The Rev. Ashton Oxenden: now Bishop of Montreal (1878).

The scene has accordingly shifted. "Old things are passed away, and all has become new." The chief actor is to appear in the Session of 1862 in the character of a radical Church Reformer. The antique building is to be subjected to a process never dreamt of in 1858. Instead of a quiet consultation about replacing decayed bricks, repairing broken plaster, repointing joints, fresh white-washing, cleaning windows, two coats of paint, and the like: the talk is now of pulling down that ivy-mantled tower, the resort of owls and jackdaws, throwing over that old wall which obstructs the vision, and excludes the light and air, lowering that pulpit to the level of people's heads, and setting open that door which has been so carefully barred and bolted for the last two hundred years.

All this sounds very revolutionary; and may account for the Bishop of London's recurring to the state of public feeling on former occasions of revision. "There never was a revision," his lordship says, "without a revolution." We must therefore, it seems, take lessons of the eel-catchers in the Lincolnshire dykes; first stir up the mud, then catch our fish. We have no chance of a hearing so long as all things are quiet.* Rouse the whole kingdom into a state of religious anarchy, pious distraction, and conscientious civil war, and then come and ask for a Commission, and you may perchance get one, but not before.

I remain, yours, &c.,

July 29, 1861.

"INGOLDSBY."

POSTSCRIPT.

In a letter to the *Times* and *Daily News*, Lord Ebury, not without reason, attributes much of the demoralised state of the

* The Prayer-book of the Reformed Episcopal Church (published by John F. Shaw, 48, Paternoster Row; 1878) has attempted a great many of the changes suggested in the text. The Volume itself, however, should be consulted in order to see the extent to which it has enlarged the basis of the National Church, while it has certainly narrowed it in another direction.

suburban population to our unreformed Liturgy. Superficial observers may not at a glance see the connexion ; and may be disposed (as indeed has been done) to ridicule the idea.* But deep thinkers will recognise sound sense and sterling wisdom, as well as kind feeling towards the lower orders, in the following remarks :—

Burglaries and garotting are very unpleasant to us, disturb our comfortable firesides, produce indignant diatribes against those in authority, and homilies on transportation—a very expensive way, but one very pleasing to the imagination of the easy-going and well-to-do—because it gets rid of a disquieting idea generated by the troublesome convict class, if we think they are still hanging about us. But Providence has written in legible characters in the history of this unfortunate class that it is not by such methods that the evil is to be dealt with ; and that nothing but this feeling of insecurity would be powerful enough to compel us to the exertion necessary to wipe out this and a hundred stains upon our Christian civilisation. I suppose we may take it for granted that the influence of religion can alone change a man's will, can make a bad man into a good one, and that this influence cannot be successfully brought to bear without the sympathising action of one mind upon another. The problem is, how can this be increased to the requisite extent ?

It is in London and our great towns that the mischief is continually producing and reproducing itself. It is in our metropolis and its satellites that large aggregations of poor people have been allowed to squat, wholly uncared for, having no kindly superintendence, moral or physical, to light the lamp of life as a guide to their ways, to succour them in distress, and encourage them in the warfare of existence. We have been told of a district of cinder-sifters, Londoners over the border, and so forth. Efforts are no doubt being made to reach these breeding grounds of our criminal population, but the Bishop of London's charge, just delivered, shows us how large an amount of waste still remains unreclaimed. Every one who knows anything of the matter must be convinced that an effort much greater than any that has yet been witnessed must be made if we are really to scotch the snake (destroy him utterly we never can) which every now and then rears his crest in so menacing a shape, and almost frightens us from our propriety. This onslaught must be made by the Church Catholic, and not as we have hitherto attempted it—as is thus described by Mr. Burke :—

‘The hon. gentleman would have us fight this confederacy of the powers of darkness with the single arm of the Church of England ;

* See, for example, an article in the *Literary Churchman* for Dec., 1862.

would have us fight not only against infidelity, but fight at the same time with all other denominations except our own. In the moment we make a front against the common enemy we have to combat with all those who are the natural friends of our cause. Strong as we are, we are not equal to this.'

This was spoken nearly a century ago. We of the National Church have ever since obstinately shut our ears to the voice of one who spoke as few men ever have spoken, and our eyes to what was passing around us, and here we are just as much as ever in need of this advice, which has now stiffened into a standing reproach to us. If any one can suggest any other remedy which will be more efficacious, let him stand up and say so; and if our reason approves it, by all means let us join hand in hand to secure its adoption; but if not, let us members of the National Church seriously take to heart the heavy responsibility which weighs upon us. It is we who are responsible. It is the schismatic provisions of our Act of Uniformity, and our decrepit Canons, coupled with our refusal to attempt the smallest remedy—the separation between our clergy and laity, caused principally by our making a kind of sacerdotal inequality; our *stately and tautological liturgy and formularies*, with their obsolete phraseology and *iron binding of rubrics, which has sown formalism broadcast throughout the land*—these and such like matters must we of the National Church consider with a view to reform, unless we are prepared to encounter and refute the charge of being ourselves the stumbling-block in the way of that united effort of the Christian Church in this country which, until the contrary is proved, I shall venture to say is the only remedy to the social evils now complained of, which are by no means confined to the breeding of a convict-class, but of which that class is its most terrible and matured development. —I am, &c.,

EBURY.

Moor Park, Dec. 17, 1862."

LETTER CXVIII.

AN HOUR WITH SPURGEON.—NO. I. THE CONVENTICLE.

"Fas est et ab hoste doceri."—VIRGIL.

"I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people; and by a foolish nation I will anger you."—Rom. x. 19.

SIR,—Your columns being now released from reporting the debates in Parliament, you will perhaps allow me space for a somewhat free discussion of a subject equal, if not superior, in

interest to many which have of late engaged the attention of the public. I allude to the mode of conducting Divine Service under the system of the Established Church, compared with that of certain classes of Nonconformists. It is a question of great delicacy, which I will endeavour to approach with all gravity, and regard to the feelings of the respective parties between whom it will be necessary for me occasionally to draw an invidious comparison.

Those who have read my previous Letters will remember that about two years ago, in consequence of the riots at St. George's-in-the-East, I was induced to pay a Sunday morning's visit to the scene of so much painful notoriety, in order to be an eye-witness, and as far as possible an impartial judge, of the conduct of both parties in that irreligious war. The temporary excitement in those parts has now happily subsided;* but it is by no means to be regretted that a faithful record should be thus preserved of the *why* and the *wherefore* things ran to such a height as at one time to require the intervention of not less than three or four hundred policemen to keep the peace during the performance of Divine Service in that Church.†

A somewhat similar motive induced me, being in town and not otherwise engaged, to pay a visit for the first time on Sunday last to the celebrated Tabernacle of Mr. Charles Haddon Spurgeon.

"What!"—I hear from the readers of the *Guardian* and *English Churchman*—"a Clergyman of the Church of Eng-

* Revived, however, in 1876, from the same unhappy cause, at St. James', Hatcham, under the Rev. Arthur Tooth, of law-resisting notoriety. See observations on this subject in an able pamphlet, entitled, *Pathway to Rome*, by W. Martin Brown, late of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Second Edition, pp. 25-7. Nisbet & Co., Berners Street, London. 1878. This tract cannot be too extensively circulated, as exhibiting in short compass the evil of Ritualism, with its *only* remedy—REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK.

† See Vol. I., Letters LXIV.—LXVI., pp. 379—399.

land going to hear Spurgeon ! and on Sunday morning too. Surely he might be better employed preaching himself ; or, at least, if he has such itching ears, listening to Trench or Wordsworth at Westminster Abbey."

Softly, my good friend. It is precisely because I am a Clergyman of the Church of England, that I went to "the Tabernacle" on a Sunday morning ; and it was also for the very reason that you allege that I gave the preference to Spurgeon on that occasion over the two divines you mention, both of whom I have more than once sat painfully under at Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, or in the gorgeous Abbey, Westminster. Other people have itching ears, besides myself ; nay, the majority I fear of the public,—as my experience as a minister of religion, extending now over thirty* years, has fully convinced me. So for once, methought, there could be no harm in making myself one of that said public with a view to seeing and judging of the sort of bait that thus attracts thousands Sunday after Sunday to a Nonconformist place of worship, while so many of our own Churches are barely half filled on the Lord's Day.

I have heard it said over and over again by brethren of my cloth, and have partly experienced the truth of the saying myself, that it is impossible for a Clergyman to fill his Church on a Sunday morning. Good congregations may be sometimes drawn in a town, or even in a tolerably sized country village, at six or seven o'clock in the evening, possibly even in an afternoon, but as for expecting to fill your Church between eleven and one o'clock in the forenoon, the thing is hopeless, and no one but a raw curate three months in Holy Orders would think of such a thing. Being anxious, therefore, to see if there were no remedy for this defect in our

* Now over five-and-forty years ;—and I can confidently affirm that for one person who attends the Church for the simple purpose of prayer and praise, ten at least are drawn by the attraction of an able preacher.

constitution, I resolved to take a peep into the enemy's camp, and ascertain by what art, magic, or spell it is that Spurgeon (for so I had been told) has drawn regularly Sunday by Sunday, for years together, enormous congregations at that unseasonable hour, and *kept them together*;—the same process being repeated in the evening of the same day.

Now making all due allowance for the very advantageous situation of the Tabernacle, and awarding to Mr. Spurgeon an unusual amount of power as a preacher, I cannot believe the effects would be so great and so lasting, were he not aided by the strong contrast his mode of conducting the service exhibits to that of the Establishment, whose system (it is to be feared), by keeping from Church a large portion of the population on the Sabbath, opens at all times a field for preachers of very inferior powers, and of course acts with proportionate advantage to the Conventicle and disadvantage to the Church, when the former is in the hands of a man of energy and gifts like those of Mr. Spurgeon.*

It is some fifty years since Sydney Smith observed, that while orthodox divines were idly busy in freezing common sense amidst whole acres and furlongs of empty benches in our well-endowed Churches and Cathedrals, the should-be congregation were being gesticulated away by some unauthorised teacher, who in holy fervour was pouring forth his ungrammatical nonsense, mounted on a tar barrel outside the walls of a wooden and reed-thatched barn. The tar barrel and the barn are not now easily to be found, unless haply in the coal-districts of South Wales, or the moorlands of Lancashire and the West Riding. But in their place what do we meet with? In hundreds of instances they

* A very fair description of the Service at the Tabernacle, and of Mr. Spurgeon himself as a Preacher, is given in "Unorthodox London," pp. 62-70, by the Rev. C. Maurice Davies, D.D. London, 1874.

have become metamorphosed into brick and tiled buildings, decent though not imposing; and in not a few cases the barn has been converted into a handsome Gothic edifice, shaming many of our Peel Churches, and the tar barrel been replaced by a pulpit where good sound English is preached Sunday by Sunday, and often on Wednesday and Friday evenings besides, to numerous and attentive listeners. Meanwhile the acres and furlongs of the Establishment still remain under the freezing process in many of our towns and villages, and we regret to say in not a few of our time-honoured and stately Cathedrals.

If this be true—and we challenge contradiction—there must surely be a grave fault somewhere. The question is, who is to blame?—The *people*, who will persist in going where they ought not to go? or the *system* which makes the Establishment repulsive by rule, and the Conventicle attractive by contrast? Our Nebuchadnezzars, in short, who set up this golden image of formalism, or our Shadrachs, Meshachs, and Abednegos, who refuse to fall down and worship it?

I will not detain you further at present. But if you admit my premises, and accept them as a sufficient justification for a Clergyman visiting a Conventicle with a view to spy out the land and bring home a report for the benefit of his own camp, I will in a future Letter detail somewhat of the proceedings at Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle on Sunday, the 25th instant. Meanwhile

I remain, yours, &c.,

August, 28, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

POSTSCRIPT.

The following report of a visit to Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle appeared in an American newspaper, as quoted in the *Church Standard* of Jan. 15, 1869:—

The rush to Mr. Spurgeon's church is so great that I took an early

start on a bright Sunday morning, in order to be among the first, if possible. On alighting at the door of the church, instead of being obliged to wait, I was met by some officer of the place and day, who inquired whether I would like to go directly into the church, and wait my chance there. Responding in the affirmative to his polite proposition, he led the way, at the same time putting into my hand a slip of paper which he begged me to read. It was a request for a contribution to Mr. Spurgeon's institution for the education of ministers. It was a very neat business transaction—one for which the practical and business-like Mr. Spurgeon is justly celebrated. It was as much as to say: 'I have taken you out of the sun and given you a chance for a good seat; now, if this amounts to anything to you, state the sum in silver or gold in the contribution box.' I stated it, and took a seat in a sort of elevated waiting-stand near the entrance. The officer told a gentleman that some 'American friends' would like seats; and we—myself and party—were soon invited forward, and seated in some of the best pews in the building.

Mr. Spurgeon's church is very large and well-contrived, capable of holding a larger congregation, I judge, than that of Mr. Beecher, in Brooklyn. Indeed, it is said that it affords comfortable sittings for five thousand persons. There were not more than five hundred persons in the church when I entered, but they came pouring in from that time forward, until every part of the building was crowded. The interior is oval, the platform pulpit standing out from one extremity, and permitting the seats to sweep entirely around, an arrangement which gives a portion of the audience the chance of only seeing the back part of the preacher's head. The personal appearance of Mr. Spurgeon has become so familiar to Americans, through engravings and descriptions of letter-writers, that I need not say more than that he impressed me, as he stepped on the stand, as a hearty, healthy, and powerful man. After giving out a hymn, and begging the congregation not to sing it too slowly, he joined with them in the music. Then he read a telegram he had just received from a distant part of the kingdom, from a man who was dying, and who found himself, in the dark hour, unsustained by the Christian's hope. His prayer for this stranger was one of the most touching things I ever heard. Indeed, the whole prayer, of which this formed an episode, was marked with great fervour, thorough spirituality, and a flow and command of language which much surpassed my expectations.

When he finished his preaching, I was not left at a loss to understand the secret of his power. He is a good man,—a strong man,—thoroughly in earnest. There were passages in his sermon, not a few, which reminded me of Beecher. The same directness, the same bursts of grand and sweeping power, the same felicities of diction which distinguish the American preacher, were scattered through the sermon.

Mr. Spurgeon's vocabulary is not so large as that of Mr. Beecher. He is not so completely *en rapport* with the world of nature, and his fancy and imagination are not so active; but he is dramatic—understands human nature—believes in Christianity (a good thing in a preacher)—knows exactly what he wants to do—and drives straight forward to the end he seeks. I do not know that Mr. Spurgeon is Mr. Beecher's superior in anything, except it may be as a business man. His faculty of organisation, of so setting other people at work as to multiply his own personal power a thousand-fold, must distinguish him, in the results of his life, from Mr. Beecher. Mr. Spurgeon is doing by organisation and institution what Mr. Beecher does by personal magnetism. Mr. Beecher inspires other men; Mr. Spurgeon educates them, and so builds and shapes the policy of institutions that he will be producing preachers after his own kind long after he has passed away. The spirit of the man is kindly. His manner towards his people is familiar and fatherly. Like the Brooklyn preacher, too, he is not without his dash of humour. In short, I left his presence with a good taste in my mouth, and the firmest wish in my heart that the Lord would send into the world and set to work ten thousand such as Mr. Spurgeon.

LETTER CXIX.

AN HOUR WITH SPURGEON.—NO. II. THE SERVICE.

"What Englishman would think of singing 'God save the Queen' to any but the one tune, or the one tune to any but the time-honoured words?"
—*Muhlenberg's Letter to Bishop Otty*, p. 37.

SIR,—Having received your permission to proceed with my report, I will first give a short description of the Tabernacle itself, which may be instructive to those who have never visited it, and who probably have little inclination to do so.

It certainly does not present many of the ordinary features of a place of worship. It has neither the dignity of a Church nor the simplicity of a Conventicle in its outward appearance. It is built in the form of a rotunda, with a handsome Grecian portico, ascended by a flight of stone steps much after the

fashion of a Museum, and entered at several doors, two or three attendants being stationed at each. By one of these functionaries, on the occasion of my visit, I was asked if I had a ticket; and on my replying in the negative, he civilly led me out of the crowd into a passage, where he directed me to a seat under the gallery at the extreme end of the building, facing the platform from which the service was performed. I had thus the best possible opportunity of judging of the ability of the preacher to reach all parts of such an enormous building,—a feat which I must say he accomplished apparently without any great effort.

My eye now rested upon a scene such as it had never before witnessed, and probably never will again. Imagine the interior of an enormous theatre, larger than the celebrated La Scala at Milan, with pit, lower, middle, and third tier of seats, calculated to accommodate, without crowding, about 5,000 persons. Imagine every sitting,—and, towards the middle of the service, much of the standing ground in the several gangways,—occupied by an attentive and respectably dressed audience; and this, gathered together week by week, not to see Blondin walking on the tight rope at Sydenham, a sham fight at Astley's, or Lord Dundreary at the Haymarket, but to be partakers in a religious ceremony, conducted by one man, the ordinary minister of the place.

The congregation consisted of about an equal proportion of both sexes, and of all ages, from fifteen to fourscore. Perfect propriety prevailed throughout, except perhaps during the process of taking seats. So completely, in short, was order observed, that, if a policeman was present at all within the building, it was not apparent, and the vast mass seemed duly impressed with a sense of the purpose for which they were assembled.

In place of the customary reading desk and pulpit of our Churches, was a spacious platform level with the first gallery,

ascended right and left by a handsome semicircular staircase. Beneath this were reserved seats, occupied (as I was informed) by Mr. Spurgeon's catechumens, a class of young men, amounting to some fifty, training for the ministry. Here too sat a reporter, who apparently took down in short-hand the whole of the sermon. The platform itself was furnished with carpet, chairs, and table, and behind this last a crimson-covered sofa. Between the table and the balustrade which fences off the platform, is a stage of about twenty feet in length and perhaps six in depth, from which Mr. Spurgeon gave out the hymns and prayers which constituted the devotional part of the service, and along which he promenaded to and fro during the delivery of the sermon with somewhat of the action of a tame lion traversing his cage. I am not exactly prepared to advocate the introduction of such a platform into our places of worship, but I have no hesitation in saying that we owe much of the stiffness of our ordinary pulpit oratory, and the coldness with which the sermon is commonly both heard and delivered, to the miserably strait and narrow boxes in which the preacher is ensconced, scarcely giving liberty for the full use of hands and arms, and utterly excluding all other action of the body. Would an Anthony have thus stirred the good citizens of Rome to a sudden fit of mutiny? Was it thus St. Paul harangued the Athenians from Mars Hill? or (to descend *in nostra tempora*) was it in this way that a Chatham electrified the Lords, a Fox or a Sheridan magnetised the Commons? And is the sound of the Gospel so feeble, is its theme so little soul-inspiring, that it alone can afford to be cabined, cribbed, confined, while the limbs are free as the tongue in the Senate, on the stage, and at the bar?

The service began at a quarter before eleven, and lasted exactly two hours; the first hour being devoted to prayers, singing, reading, and exposition of Scripture, the second wholly to the sermon. I notice this the more, as a proof, in

passing, that it is not so much the absolute length, as the unvarying routine, the repetitions, and icy formality of our Church system, which tend to make the usual Morning Service tedious even to religious persons, and notoriously repulsive to others. There are exceptions no doubt to this rule; and, latterly, the custom of dividing the service, as is done by many High Churchmen, has materially obviated the evil; but this division can only be accomplished successfully in towns, and when several clergymen are employed. The *rule* holds generally in the *country*, and in *all Churches* where the service is *not* so divided.*

Precisely as the clock struck the quarter, dressed in a plain frock coat, without any robes or bands, Mr. Spurgeon advanced to the front of the platform, and commenced by delivering an extempore prayer of eight or ten minutes' duration, the congregation sitting, or slightly leaning forward. This was followed by a hymn, which he gave out verse by verse as it was sung by the bulk of the congregation, all standing. The tune to which the hymn was set was, to my no small astonishment, that of "God save the Queen." It was sung, as may be supposed, with no small effect by some two or three thousand voices, the congregation consisting of about 5,000; but I could not help feeling with the American divine, quoted in my motto, that the tune was ill-adapted to any but the time-honoured words, and sounded strangely out of place on this occasion. What might be the case with the habitual frequenters of the Tabernacle I cannot say; but for myself, not being familiar with the words of the *hymn* to which the tune was adapted, and having no book to refer to, it was

* The author has done something towards obviating this in his own Church by alternating the Litany and pre-communion, and occasionally making other abridgments in the Service, especially on Festival Sundays, and during the depth of winter.

impossible to prevent the mind and almost the tongue running into the groove of

“Confound their politics;
Frustrate their knavish tricks,”

and the rest. I would submit, therefore, to the Coryphæus of that vast assembly, whether it might not be in better taste to confine his selection of tunes to such as are commonly applied to words of seriousness, and not to secularise devotion by the mixture of anything, however excellent in itself, calculated to distract the attention of the worshippers.

The hymn concluded, Mr. Spurgeon walked to the table, and taking his stand between it and the sofa, opened a large and handsome clasped Bible, (the gift, I was told, of the congregation,) “and when he had found a place,” which was on this occasion the latter part of the sixth chapter of Ephesians, he proceeded to read it with a slow and articulate voice, dwelling upon the more impressive passages, which he illustrated, by a short extemporaneous comment as he went along. Never did I hear the “first” or “second Lesson” in our Churches delivered with like effect. Often, too often, have I mourned to hear them mangled in the reading, or hurried through as if a secondary portion of the service for the day, and *never* (as is well known) accompanied by the smallest attempt at exposition, however “hard to be understood,” or however fertile of profitable instruction for the humbler class of worshippers. Not a word must pass the lips of the orthodox Minister,—the unfeigned-assent-and-consent-subscriber to our Liturgy—during the time of reading the Prayers and appointed Lessons of the day, but what is set down for him in the book, and has been so set down for the last 200 or more years, and (according to the Bishop of Oxford) will be set down for the next 200. If the officiating minister break this rule,—if he attempt, for example, on the 26th of next month, upon reading the

Second Lesson for the Evening Service, to interrupt the course of Scripture by explaining how the feet of a Christian may be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, or his head covered with the helmet of salvation, he renders himself liable to an action for brawling in Church, and may be sequestered from his living for as long a period as if he had been guilty of immorality, or had contravened any of the Thirty-nine Articles of religion !

This same chapter, or rather portion of it, explained as he went along by Mr. Spurgeon, was a sermon in itself ; and was listened to with profound attention, and I will venture to say corresponding edification by all that multitude, who thus drank in the words of the Apostle, made plain and intelligible to the humblest comprehension, at the same time impressed upon all with a fervour and simplicity of illustration, worthy both of the matter and object of the writer.

The reading and expounding of Scripture was succeeded by another short hymn, set this time to the more appropriate tune of “Adeste Fideles,” and sung, as before, by the bulk of the congregation. No organ or instrument of any kind was heard, nor was any needed. Next followed another extempore prayer, longer than the former, and differing from it chiefly in this respect, that whereas *that* was *general*, this was *special* in its character. For example,—“There will be those present who are labouring under some bodily or mental affliction, or have friends or relatives in distress. Comfort them, O God, according to their need, and in thy good time give them deliverance out of all their troubles, and grant that these may be sanctified to their eternal welfare and the strengthening and refreshing of their souls, through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord. There will be those again, &c.—” particularising imaginary cases, with adaptation to their several requirements, in a manner eminently calculated to bring home to each individual present the value and importance

of *personal* prayer; a point in which (with the exception perhaps of the Litany) our own Service is decidedly defective. For granting that, to a well organised and cultivated mind, the Liturgy of our Church may be *made to apply* to every conceivable case of human woe, want, or desire, it can hardly be denied that the chastity of its language throws it rather above the apprehension of the lower orders, who in consequence fail to derive from it that spiritual comfort which simpler and more direct application to their individual position will often better supply. This is nowhere more evident than in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, as any minister of tolerable experience must have repeatedly found; and the same remark applies in its degree to all the services of the Establishment, and in a great measure no doubt accounts for the comparative absence of the poor from our Churches.

In the tract recently published at New York, from which our motto is taken, complaint is made that under no conceivable contingency is the liberty of extempore prayer granted to a Minister of the Established Church during the hours of Divine Service; and we must admit that such complaint is not made without reason, though fully alive to the danger of the permission (if granted) being occasionally abused. Something of this kind, it is certain, is wanting to our stately and correct form of prayer to bring it home to the feelings of the million, and to keep alive their interest through the time usually occupied in its delivery.

The prayer ended, another and longer hymn was sung, concluding with "Allelujah," the effect of which was most impressive, as issuing simultaneously from some thousand voices at all parts of the building. Then followed the sermon. But this I must reserve for a separate letter, as it was undoubtedly the grand attraction to the place.

Meanwhile, I would ask my readers to review calmly what

I have written, and to bear in mind that I can have no possible motive (but quite the reverse) for exalting the Conventicle at the expense of the Church ; while I would fain have the latter, where it can, take a lesson from the former ; as on the other hand, as far as rests with myself, I would see the former amalgamated with the latter by such a relaxation of the terms of subscription as I am persuaded might, with safety and charity, be undertaken.

That *something* is wrong *somewhere*, when thousands are thus seen to rush Sunday by Sunday (for several years' continuance) to listen to an unauthorised teacher, and to partake in what, without meaning to give offence, I must designate as a schismatical form of worship, is but too manifest ; while the contrast is made more painful by the languid manner in which the ministrations of the Establishment are but too frequently conducted, and the many vacancies seen along our benches, notwithstanding all the appliances used to induce a willing and regular attendance.

I am, yours, &c.,

Sept. 13, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXX.

AN HOUR WITH SPURGEON.—NO. III. THE PREACHER.

“Ille per extentum funem mihi posse videtur
Ire poeta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,
Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,
Ut magus ; et modo me Thebis, modo ponit Athenis.”

HORACE.

SIR,—It is probably not generally known that Blondin's art was familiar to the ancients ; so much so, that upwards of eighteen hundred years ago the Roman Satirist estimated it as equal in difficulty to that of the successful dramatist—the

business of each being, in his respective vocation, first to draw, and then to engage the attention of, a numerous assemblage of people.

To compare grave matters with gay, the same may be said of the preacher's art. There can be no denying that his primary business is to draw a congregation, his second to keep them awake to the importance of his mission. Though he speak with the tongue of men and of angels, and have not this power, he is nothing. All the learning and piety in the world will not supply the want of a good delivery, and the tact to suit your discourse to the character of your audience. Herein lies the great secret of Mr. Spurgeon's success. He has taken the measure of his congregation's taste and capacity, and adapts himself to it. Like the cunning doctor in *Lucretius*, he anoints the lips of his cup with honey, and so cheats his patients into swallowing the salutiferous draught. Religion is made agreeable to his hearers, but it is still religion. He makes it apparent both in his preaching and practice, that her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace.

A second great cause of Mr. Spurgeon's continued popularity is, that he is mighty in the Scriptures. This is his deep well, and he is not sparing of its resources. He draws and draws again as he has occasion, and he does it without forcing. He has carefully studied *John Bunyan*, and copies him here with considerable skill. Thirdly, he is evidently a man of prayer, and feels therein a hidden source of strength which does not fail him at his need. The same gift which empowers him to pour forth his two extempore prayers in the early part of the service, accompanies him throughout his sermon, and chastens and subdues even the more attractive portions of the discourse. In his lightest illustrations he bears still in mind the object and the occasion, and thus escapes splitting on a rock that has foundered many

a preacher of oratorical powers equal, but hardly superior, to his own.

In addition to all this, which would be sufficient to establish the position of most ministers of the Gospel, he possesses naturally a full, clear, and melodious voice, which enables him without apparent exertion to penetrate the furthest recesses of that enormous building. He has, moreover, an accurate and quick ear, and an expressive eye, developing in a remarkable degree the organ of language, aided by those of ideality, comparison, gaiety, wonder, veneration, and constructiveness. His manner is agreeable, and he is blest with a large fund of animal spirits, and considerable physical strength. Such are Mr. Spurgeon's natural and acquired qualifications as a preacher, to which he has not disdained to add the great advantages of careful study and long cultivation. He understands, too, the art of concealing his art. He holds himself entirely under control. And if for a moment he appears to give way to the excitement of the topic, and allows free rein to his tongue, he still has it under subjection, and returns to a quieter mood without effort, and without constraint. His transitions are natural, and pleasantly relieve the outline of his bolder strokes. He is no windy orator, and knows when to pause, when to turn. He does not run either himself or his subject out of breath. His diction, though rapid, is sufficiently choice; his illustrations well selected and full of meaning. His energy is prodigious, and his earnestness bears all the appearance of sincerity and truth.

Recommendations like these—and I am inclined to think the habitual attendants upon Mr. Spurgeon will not consider them exaggerated*—would have made a popular preacher

* I have myself heard him twice. First, on the occasion mentioned in the text. Secondly, in August, 1861, when I went again expressly with a

under any circumstances. But there remains yet to be pointed out the master key to the extraordinary *éclat* which has for so many years attended this Phoenix of Nonconformity. It lies, I have no hesitation in saying, in the freedom of his position. Mr. Spurgeon neither prays nor preaches in chains. He is unconscious of the sword of his Bishop or the Privy Council hanging by a hair over his head. He is not, I believe, of the Independent persuasion ; but he is independent (notwithstanding) of everything except the favour of his flock,* who are worthy of him, and he of them. They are mutually fond of each other ; exacting and expecting no more than is due between minister and people. The latter not extreme to mark what is said or done amiss ; the former not fearing to give offence.

It is this good understanding which, as it first contributed largely to draw his congregation, now serves to cement it. Meanwhile it should not be forgotten that Mr. Spurgeon possesses the additional stimulus of a remarkably propitious soil for the full development of his genius. His Tabernacle stands in a densely peopled district of the middle and lower orders, where the voluntary system will always work to the best advantage ; a system which, be its defects what they may, (and we are far from advocating it for general adoption,) has at least the merit of eliciting and bringing into the foreground all the talent and capabilities of its teachers. Under it a preacher finds his level as surely, and almost as quickly, as do air and water. No envy or petty jealousy depresses him. No nepotism or favoritism keeps him perpe-

view to correct my judgment, before making public a critique upon certainly the most powerful preacher of the day ; and, marvellous to relate, he has continued up to this time with almost unabated popularity, and allowing himself but short intervals of repose. (1878).

* It has been said, with much truth I believe, that an Independent minister is the only *dependent* member of the congregation.

tually in the background. Conservatism or Radicalism form no part of his religious profession. He has neither to crawl into favour with his diocesan, nor to set his barometer daily to the level indicated by the political horizon.

Can the same be said of the 20,000 ministers under the Establishment; and is it then surprising that we meet with few or no Spurgeons in the Church?

I have heard it remarked, by a London Physician of extensive practice (Budd), that there is no profession in which there is such a *waste of power* as in the Established Church. You shall find a Sydney Smith narrowly escaping being buried for life upon a curacy in the middle of Salisbury Plain, while the pulpit of some neighbouring rectory of £700 per annum was being occupied, and that for half a century, by icy formalism or drowsy imbecility. It may be justly questioned whether St. Paul himself would not have dwarfed to the capacity of his audience had he been doomed to address none but a congregation of a hundred and fifty rusties one hundred and four times a-year, for thirty or more years continuously!—And most certain it is that Wesley, like many another village Hampden, would have gone to his grave unhonoured and unknown, had not the spirit strong within him driven him forth from “the fens and fogs of Lincolnshire” to preach the Gospel of salvation to the lost sheep of the collieries and mines in Cornwall and Wales.*

It is not necessary to detain my readers with an account of the particular sermon it was my chance to hear. The text was Psalm xv. 1: “Lord, who shall dwell in thy tabernacle: or who shall rest upon thy holy hill?” And the aim of the

* It is to be regretted that his so-called disciples have not confined themselves to such spheres of undoubted usefulness, instead of intruding into quiet villages and hamlets, where too frequently their hebdomadal appearance serves no other purpose than to foster and keep alive a spirit of “envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness.”

preacher was to illustrate, much after the fashion of the Pilgrim's Progress, the difficulties, dangers, backslidings, and encouragements, which attend life's wayfarer in ascending the hill of the Lord, until he rest upon the top of it.

The delivery was powerful, varied, and well sustained. No vulgarisms, no "ungrammatical English," little or no straining for effect. Here and there the hands were uplifted, the eyes raised to heaven, the arms extended, and the whole man thrown into the argument. But what of that? Shall we be told that such "gesticulations" are beneath the dignity of the pulpit; that good taste revolts from it, and piety is offended? Whence then, and why, came those 5,000 who formed the congregation, and have formed it for many years;* and why come they not to hear us as well as Spurgeon?

Let us not be ashamed to take a leaf here out of the enemy's book. Let us be content to be provoked to jealousy by them that are no church, and angered into a laudable emulation by those whom we are pleased to call "a foolish people." Let us beware lest the compliment be returned upon us with interest, and the folly proved in the long run to be on the side of those who have, for one cause or another, driven half the nation into the arms of Dissent.† True

* A statement has been published that Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle "accommodates, and is ordinarily attended by, an audience of 8,000 persons, and that another such is being built to contain even a larger number." ("Religious Liberty," &c. By Rev. J. Dight, LL.B. London: 1863. P. 18.) If this be true, incredible as it may seem, the argument in the text is unanswerable.

† In his late Charge the Bishop of London (Tait) admits that of "the large number of persons who are separated from the National Church, a great proportion feel no repugnance to our doctrinal formularies, and are willing to assent generally to our teaching. They probably occasionally join in our worship; *or if they abstain from doing so, it is not because in our confessions, prayers, thanksgivings, or songs of praise, they find anything inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel.*"—Bishop of London's Charge, 1862. p. 40. Does not this indicate that there is something in our manner of conducting the services

wisdom should incline us to accommodate our manner to the tastes, or even, if it be so, to the weaknesses of our people, so long as truth is not hazarded or the full teaching of the Gospel withheld. Our business is, surely, to catch souls; and we must catch them as we *can*, if this may not be done as we *would*.

And if we find, as some of us doubtless do, to our distress and perhaps to our annoyance, that after a few years our congregation falls off, or does not increase in proportion to our zeal;—if we find in short that silly people will give the preference to the rant of the conventicle, over our carefully studied and closely argued weekly discourses—why e'en let us try the ranting system too, though under the control of our higher cultivation and better taste. It will not hurt us to move our arms occasionally as well as our lips—we need not blush to suit the action to the word and the word to the action—and if we find it answer, to our surprise and perhaps to our disgust, let us be content to lay the blame on our audience, and ascribe our success to their want of taste.

In a word let us “Spurgeonise* the Church.” It cannot be that the whole skill of preaching lies with one man. Why may not the same thing be done as well by a Churchman as a Baptist? The venerable Simeon, in my younger days, thus filled to overflowing the Church of the Holy Trinity at Cambridge—and “he being dead yet speaks” in his works. Let him speak also by living imitators of his example. There are a few of them—but they are but a few. A handful scattered up and down the land, to make the contrast painfully conspicuous.

which repels, or at least fails to attract them; or something in our Service-book too formal and stilted for the use of the million?

* The author was told that this expression gave offence in some quarters. Be it so. But alas, after nearly twenty years' additional experience he sees no reason to alter or to withdraw it. See on this subject, Letter cxxix.

But what will people say, if we are to have a Simeon or a Spurgeon in every Church?—

Let them say what they please, so long as they cannot say, with some show of truth, that while the ministers of the Establishment are idly busy freezing common sense amidst whole acres and furlongs of empty benches, their should-be congregation is being gesticulated away by the fervid eloquence of a Spurgeon, or the ungrammatical effusions of Mr. Stubbs.*

I remain, yours, &c.,

Sept. 30, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”

POSTSCRIPT.

Having repeatedly in the course of these Letters quoted with approval from the writings of Sydney Smith, I have the less scruple in expressing a diversity of opinion from his remarks on the subject of “Methodism” in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1808:—

“The Tabernacle really is to the Church what Sadler’s Wells is to the drama. There popularity is gained by vaulting and tumbling,—by low arts, which the regular Clergy are not too idle to have recourse to, but too dignified. Their institutions are chaste and severe—they endeavour to do that which, upon the whole and for a great number of years, will be found to be the most admirable and the most useful. It is no part of their plan to descend to small artifices for the sake of present popularity and effect. The religion of the common people under the government of the Church may remain as it is for ever;—the enthusiasm must be progressive or it will expire.”†

It is more than half a century since the above remarks were made. The question therefore resolves itself into the old proverb of “the pudding.” Has the influence of the Taber-

* The legal decision notwithstanding, we are not disposed to recognise these self-constituted ministers under their lately adopted title of “the Reverend.”

† *Fit and Wisdom of Sydney Smith*. Longmans, London: 1861. P. 65.

nacle decreased, or has the Church extended its hold upon the affections of the people in that long interval? Has not, on the contrary, the tendency towards Nonconformity, amongst the middle and lower classes, been progressive, and the hold of the Church in the same direction (until of late years) been stationary, if not relaxed? And if so, is it not worth inquiry, by men of the wisdom and liberality of Sydney Smith, whether the "dignity, chastity, and severity" of the Church might not be seasoned to advantage with some of those "small artifices" which are found to be so successful elsewhere, and which, if enlisted in the cause of winning souls, can hardly be considered as at any time out of place?

LETTER CXCI.

THE COMPASS AND CHURCH REFORMER.*

"Est aliquid quo tendis, et in quod dirigis arcum?"—PERSIUS.

SIR,—The heathen moralist held it as essential to success in life that a young man should have some object in view, to which all his energies should be directed,† and to which his every action should be either subordinate or supplemental. The same rule might be applied to a new periodical like your own, just starting into life, and seeking to battle its way

* Such was the title adopted by the Journal in which many of the previous Letters appeared; but alas! it shared the fate of all Church Reformers, to receive more kicks than halfpence, and became extinct in the second year of its existence. The editor was generally understood to be the Rev. J. S. Blackwood, D.D., Vicar of Middleton Tyas, Yorkshire, and author of an able tract entitled, "RITUALISM and REVISION." 1867.

† We very much fear this excellent piece of advice is sadly neglected by "the rising generation," who seem more bent on present amusement than on future advancement in life.

through many surrounding difficulties to a firm standing ground in public opinion.

You have adopted a bold and novel title. There can be no mistake as to your intentions. Your bow is evidently bent, and your arrow pointed in a right direction. The advocates for Church Reform in all its branches know now where to look for a channel through which to communicate their thoughts; and it will be your business to see that their expectations are not disappointed. Clergymen, as a general rule, find it the reverse of politic, *whatever they may think*, to declare themselves openly as Church Reformers. It is written over the door of entrance to all Bishopries, Deaneries, and Canonries, "*Lasciate ogni speranza*," ye who would enter in the reforming capacity—and with Archdeaconries, Chaplaincies, Rural Deaneries, Honorary Canonries,* Rectories, Vicarages, and Perpetual Curacies, the rule is still more stringent. But with the laity the case is widely different; and here you ought to meet with much encouragement, and a proportionate freedom of advice.

To whichever of these classes your present correspondent may belong,—for that is a secret,†—know this, that he heartily sympathises with your professed object, and (so long as he is permitted to preserve the incognito) will not shrink from declaring his opinions.

The legislation of the last thirty years has no doubt rendered your task less Herculean than it otherwise would have been; but much remains yet to be done. The river of reform has been turned in upon the accumulated filth of two hundred years, and has swept away a good deal that was offensive to the eye and other senses. A generation has grown

* Such are not the men whom Bishops (in whom this description of patronage is vested) delight to honour;—and they seldom, if ever, do so.

† The "Ingoldsby Letters" were not published under the name of the Author till they were collected in two Volumes for permanent reference.

up, and is rapidly multiplying, who know of most of the past abuses of pluralities, non-residence, nepotism,* and the like, only or chiefly by report, and are now largely profiting by the legislation of 1834—7. We rarely, if ever now-a-days, hear of two or even *three* valuable livings held in different parts of the kingdom by the same individual, *himself residing upon none of them*, as in a case once familiar to the writer of these lines.† It is not usual just now for a young man to “enter the Church” (as it was called) with a scarcely disguised view to the loaves and fishes, or because “the family living” happens to be situated conveniently for the Belvoir hunt. Comparatively few instances are to be met with, of miserably underpaid curates, with large families, doing the work of the absentee Rector, who answered “*Here*” triennially to the Episcopal call, and complained in doing so that “every letter of the word had cost him a guinea” in travelling expenses.‡ Few and far between are the country villages in which there is not a decent schoolroom and comely parsonage; scarcely is one to be found in which the dilapidated rectory is inhabited (as was not uncommonly the case thirty years ago) by no more respectable occupant than the racked tenant of the glebe farm. These are annals of the past, and are rapidly sinking into oblivion, to furnish statistics for some future writer of the history of the Church in the nineteenth century; and this altered state of things, be it observed to its credit, we owe mainly to a Parliament, which it is the fashion with some people to represent as an omnium gatherum of Jews, Quakers, Unitarians, Roman Catholics, Infidels, and Heretics.

* The late Bishop Davys, of Peterborough, observed to a friend of the author's, “If a bishop does not provide for his own family, I should like to know who will!” He accordingly took good care of his own.

† This was the case with the Rector of Burton Coggles, the neighbouring village to Ingoldsby, when the author came to reside at the latter place, in 1846; the former being *then* “served” by a curate.

‡ A fact also known to the author.

One would imagine, after so much done in the way of improvement, there could be little left to do. But Reform, like the fabled hydra, is a creature of many heads, and multiplies fast against the knife. To return to the unsavoury figure of our Augean stable, we have but scoured the floor, and sweetened the air, by removing the more disgusting objects out of sight and smell. We breathe, it is true, a freer atmosphere, and can walk and look about us without fear of pollution. But, in doing so, our eyes are but the more easily directed to other matters needing to be attended to, before the place is what it should be, and what (with a little of your assistance) we will yet hope to make it.

The roof, you will observe, is not altogether watertight, and is smothered with cobwebs; the foundation at the east end wants looking to; the western wall is bulged, and requires buttressing; the drains should be opened, and the outfall attended to; the bolts and bars must be made to run easier; the windows are old-fashioned; the doors want widening. The whole edifice, in short, though sound in the main, requires a thorough and efficient repair. It is with joy, therefore, that we hail in *The Compass and Church Reformer* a fellow-labourer able and willing to lend a hand where wanted; a workman needing not to be ashamed; regardless of the favour of man, and what is far more unusual, indifferent to his frown; seeking his only reward in the testimony of an approving conscience, the secret pulsations of a fearless and honest heart.

Viewing you in this light (very differently from what you will be represented by others) as the truest friend to the Church and your country, I will conclude by setting before you a short programme of what appears to myself at this moment most needed to put our venerable parent in such a state of efficiency as she is well capable of, but as yet is very far from having attained to.

I. First and foremost I would have you advocate, through evil report and through good report, a thorough Revision from beginning to end of our Book of Common Prayer; and, of course, as a necessary preliminary or consequence to this, a repeal or modification of the Act of Uniformity of 1662.

II. It is worthy of inquiry among the pious, learned, and discreet members of our Church, whether the time has not arrived when a revisal should take place of the received version of the Holy Scriptures, both Old and New Testament,* with a view to availing ourselves of the stores of critical and Biblical knowledge which have accumulated during a period of near three hundred years; and affording at the same time an opportunity, much needed, of bringing the Bible and Prayer-book version of the Psalms into unison, so that one form should be adopted for the future, instead of two as at present.

III. Greater liberty is required in the use of Holy Scripture during divine service, with a less rigid observance of the prescribed order of Lessons† and other parts of the Book of Common Prayer. It seems also hard to forbid the adoption of extempore prayer, and all exposition of Scripture, during the same.

IV. Few people would object to a fundamental recasting of the Book of Canons; rejecting those that have become obsolete through time, and adapting others to the present condition of the Church.‡

* This is about being accomplished by two Committees. The time they have occupied in the work speaks volumes for their good intentions; let us hope the result may establish as much for their wisdom and judgment.

† The New Lectionary, now about being finally sanctioned by the law, partly but not wholly meets the requirement in the text. (1878.)

‡ See Letter cviii., pp. 217—227. A presentment on this subject was made to the Bishop of London (Tait) at his Visitation, Nov. 28th, 1862, by G. H. Beckford and Henry Hoare, Churchwardens of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, and was published at length in the *Times* of the following day.

V. A reform of Ecclesiastical Law in all its branches, more particularly as affects the discipline of the Clergy, has been long and loudly called for.

VI. The question of Dilapidations, though it has been partly attempted, remains still unsettled, and demands immediate and grave attention.*

VII. It is hardly necessary to say that the Church-rate question should be, if possible, amicably arranged, as between the Church and the Nonconformists.†

VIII. The disposal of Church patronage has long called for reform. The open sale of advowsons and next presentations is a great scandal to the country. And it is worthy of consideration whether several of the poorer Chancellor's livings might not be advantageously disposed of by private contract; ‡ the proceeds to be applied towards increasing the endowment of such livings, or other small ones in private or episcopal patronage.

IX. The office of Rural Dean, and the appointment to Honorary Canonries, would be generally regarded with more favour, were some stipend (say £50 or £100 a year) annexed to them, and corresponding duties exacted. It is notorious that any duty, to be well discharged, should be paid for; and if there be no duty attached, an office becomes simply an *onus*, not an *honor*.

X. The whole question of Convocation or Synodical action requires to be brought under review. The present system will not work, and consequently is exposed to ridicule. The

* An Act on this subject has been since passed, but is not altogether satisfactory. (1878.)

† An Act to do away with the *compulsory* collection of Church Rates was passed in 1868, to the great loss of the Church, especially in country places.

‡ This has since been in great measure accomplished by Lord Westbury's useful Act of 1864, for the sale of some of the smaller livings in the patronage of the Lord Chancellor.

election of Proctors, as now conducted, is simply a farce,* and just umbrage is taken at the undue proportion of the delegated to the *so-called elected* members of the Lower House.

XI. The increase of the Episcopacy, and subdivision of dioceses in several instances, is a matter that has been widely canvassed, and received with general approbation. [And has since been largely acted on;—notably in the establishment of the Bishoprics of St. Albans and Truro in 1877-8, with the now projected Bishoprics of Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield (1878).]

XII. An inquiry is needed into the working of the Ecclesiastical Commission; more particularly as regards the better provision for spiritual destitution in the neighbourhood of the Metropolis and other large towns.†

The above twelve points may be considered as forming at this time the chief *desiderata* to the more efficient working of the Church. You will allow that they embrace a sufficiently wide field; so much so, as fully to justify the title you have adopted, and which I trust you mean to be no mere *brutum fulmen*, but a well-directed and well-sustained battery to carry all or most of them. In such your endeavour I heartily bid you God speed. You will be prepared to meet with much opposition, and encounter some obloquy and ill-will; but you have doubtless counted the cost, and are ready to abide the issue. That you may not be discouraged, but may have strength and wisdom given you from Above for this good work, is the sincere prayer of your hearty well-wisher and fellow-labourer and sufferer,

Nov. 20, 1861.

“INGOLDSBY.”‡

* See Vol. I., Letter XLVIII., pp. 309—313; also Vol. II., Letter CXXX.

† A Commission on this subject was obtained by Mr. Henry D. Seymour in 1862. See before, p. 266.

‡ The author may be fairly excused for claiming some credit to himself for having thus called public attention to these twelve points of the Reformers'

LETTER CXXII.

RETROSPECT OF REVISION FOR THE YEAR 1861.

“However we may be disposed to let the question alone, it will not let us alone.”—DEAN TRENCH *on the Revision of the Bible*, p. 137.

SIR,—It is long since I have troubled you with the Revision question, but you must not infer therefrom that it is either gone to sleep, or that its authors despair of ultimate success. The present year is the Bicentenary of the celebrated Bartholomew’s Day, 1662, and it is expected that efforts will be made in it to obtain a modification of the oppressive Act of Uniformity, which, by narrowing the basis of the Established Church, has done much to foster and sustain the spirit of Dissent throughout the empire.

Assuming that the Prayer-book is, upon the whole, the best manual of its kind extant. Assuming that it is more comprehensive in its spirit than any other known Directory for public worship, can it be denied that it is very far from perfection, and that it admits of improvement in a great variety of instances? * Can it also be denied that, for some reason or other, there is a wide-spread alienation from the Establishment, as indicated not only by the extraordinary success of Mr. Spurgeon’s Tabernacle (enlarged upon before), but also by the number and splendour of Congregational or Independent places of worship erected of late in most of our large cities? If this be so, it is surely incumbent upon us Churchmen to look the matter fairly in the face, and try, before it be too late, the

charter, *all of which* have received more or less redress since the above was written, and portions are even now under consideration. (1878.)

* Three *revised* Prayer-books have been since published, one by the Irish branch of the Church; another by the Prayer-book Revision Society, 17, Buckingham Street, W.C.; the third by the “Reformed Episcopal Church in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland” (J. F. Shaw, 1878)

effect of such remedial measures as may be at least harmlessly attempted, and would benefit our own Church, if there were not a single Dissenter in the land.

But our present business is rather to review the past, than to speculate on the future. It has been our practice, since the commencement of these letters, to take an estimate of the state of the Revision agitation at the close of each year, and it may be as well to do so now; for though the year 1861 has not been so prolific as some of its predecessors, it has not been barren of events marking the onward progress of the movement.

The first feature in the past year, connected with this question, was the appearance of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, professing to give a *résumé* of the history of the present sustained cry for Revision from its commencement, and arguing therefrom the expediency, if not the necessity, of giving heed to it. One thing, however, will hardly escape the observation of any ingenuous reader of the article, that while it adopts *largely the sentiments*, and in not a few instances the *ipsissima verba* of the Ingoldsby Letters, they are never once, directly or indirectly, alluded to by the writer, whoever he may be.* Was it because "Ingoldsby" has been too honest to bind himself to the Shibboleth of a party; or was it, that the *Sic vos non vobis* principle might be the more successfully carried out, and the Reviewer shily gain credit for thoughts and words which were not his own?† Be that as it may, there is much in the article worthy of deep consideration; and we reckon it no small advantage to the cause we have so long advocated that it has at length attracted the

* The article was generally attributed to Dean Stanley of Westminster.

† That "one man soweth, and another reapeth," is one of the most indisputable truisms of life:

"INGOLDSBY, sic vestras abstulit alter opes."

attention of that powerful organ of public opinion, the great literary leviathan of the North. Whether, therefore, the article in question have its root in envy and jealousy or in good will, the cause of Revision cannot but have been promoted by it, and therein do we rejoice, yea, and we will rejoice.

The second feature to be noticed is, the free discussion of the subject in the Lower House of Convocation in the following month, when the Dean of Norwich (Pellw) brought forward his long-threatened motion, seconded by the Rev. Ashton Oxenden, Proctor for the Diocese of Canterbury.*

Having recently devoted a separate letter† to the discussion of the Dean's speech on that occasion (subsequently published, with an appendix in reply to his chief opponents), it is not necessary to enlarge further on it here. Suffice it to say that too much importance cannot be attached to this apparently small matter. Let any one who has watched the progress of this agitation since February, 1858, when it first encountered the united opposition of the Prelates in the Upper House of Convocation, compare the then state of public feeling and information on the subject with what appears from the discussion of the Dean's motion, and they will at once admit our grounds for hailing that debate as a strong proof how much the question has advanced every way in the course of the past three years. It is true the motion was withdrawn. But upon what grounds?—How was it supported?—How was it opposed?—Look on this picture and on that, and judge of the respective position of the parties for and against. How different, too, the tone of the principal speakers to that adopted by those who spoke and wrote against Revision in 1858-9. We consider this, upon the whole, the most hopeful sign of the past year, and trust

* Lately, the much respected Bishop of Montreal. (1878.)

† Letter cxvi., p. 270.

the Dean will persevere in pressing his motion,* until in some form or other it receives the sanction of the House.

Thirdly comes the attempt at enacting a new Canon on the subject of parents appearing as sponsors for their own children at baptism. Let no one despise that attempt because it proved abortive. It is most significant in one sense, though insignificant in another. It marks in a decided manner that there is a restlessness in the Church, and that the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce) is aware of it. His lordship is no finality man as far as the Canons are concerned; though (most unaccountably) his language still is that "he will not have the Prayer-book touched." At the same time the stand made against the new Canon by the Irish prelates, under the instruction of their legal advisers, betrays the utter helplessness of the Church to essay any, even the smallest, reform *proprio motu*; and proves that a general synod of the United Church,† or the issue (which we have always advocated) of a Royal Commission, is the only constitutional remedy open, to meet this and all other matters connected with Ecclesiastical reform.‡

Fourthly, in point of *time* if not of importance, must be reckoned the Parliamentary progress of the question during the year. Bearing in mind the nearly balanced state of political parties at this moment, when even the great Reform bubble is in abeyance, and the Church-rate was carried in the affirmative in a crowded house by the casting vote of the

* Alas, the threescore and ten years, and consequent infirmities, of the Very Reverend Revisionist prevented the realisation of this hope!

† Not, however, to consist wholly of Bishops, like the Pan-Anglican Synods (whatever that may mean) which have been somewhat fashionable of late—and it may well be asked "*Cui bono?*"

‡ But it is essential for this purpose that the Commission be a fair one, and not clogged with the presence of men known beforehand to be hostile to the object in view, and determined to thwart it by frivolous and vexatious delays; such a course is simply suicidal from the outset.

Speaker, it was not to be expected that Lord Ebury should press the Revision question to a division, or even to a serious debate in the House of Lords. It is only surprising that he should have ventured upon it at all, and not have shrunk from declaring to the House, and (through the press) to the public at large, that his own views and those of his supporters were not altered, and that he would formally renew his motion (though in a somewhat modified shape) in the next Session.* It is evident, therefore (as Dean Trench observes in our motto of to-day, with respect to another description of Revision), that however the Bishops and others may be disposed to let the Revision of the Prayer-book alone, it will not let them alone; it has been too effectually stirred ever again to go to sleep; and the difficulties, be they few or be they many, will have to be encountered. It is proved, in short, to the dullest Clerical comprehension, that the time has at length arrived, as the Dean concludes, "when the inconveniences of remaining where we are have become so manifestly greater than the inconveniences of action, that this last is inevitable."

There are a few lesser details, connected with the question, belonging to the year 1861, which should not be passed over in silence. Amongst them may be mentioned the elevation of Bishop Baring to the See of Durham, which can hardly be regarded as other than a hopeful sign, as he is almost the only prelate on the Bench who has openly espoused the cause of the Revisionists.† The elevation of Lord John Russell to the Upper House of Parliament will probably

* Lord Ebury's remarks on the occasion are published in the reports of the Association for Promoting a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, 17, Buckingham Street. It is believed that his lordship purposes ere long bringing out the whole of his Speeches in an enlarged and annotated form.

† Of this truly Protestant Prelate, see Letters xeviii., xcix., pp. 158—166. His lordship has been compelled to resign his see, from ill health, while these pages were passing through the press (Dec. 9, 1878).

supply Lord Ebury with a supporter when next the subject comes before the Lords. The list of publications in favour of Revision has considerably multiplied,* and the cry is still, "They come."

Finally, the Revision Association is firmly established in its new offices,† with an enlarged staff of Vice-Presidents and Council, and an increasing number of members and contributors. Altogether, therefore, we may conclude that the last year has not fallen behind its predecessors in marking the progress of the measure, and we look forward hopefully to the future, though we must say with less sanguine expectation of immediate success than we once entertained.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Jan. 19, 1862.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER CXXIII.

LORD EBURY'S TWO BILLS OF 1862.

"That man is not the discoverer of any art who first says the thing; but he who says it so long, and so loud, and so clearly, that he compels mankind to hear him."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1826.

SIR,—Sydney Smith has the credit of being the author of the above very just remark, which he illustrates by the

* Amongst these was a curious pamphlet in the form of an amicable controversy between a layman and a clergyman, rejoicing respectively in the names of Tooth and Edge. (Hamilton and Adams.) It turned chiefly upon the baptismal difficulty, with the usual result, that, after a good deal of showing teeth without biting, and of fencing without drawing blood, each party left off as he began, wholly unconvinced by the arguments of his opponent. See Letter LXXVI., p. 38 (of Mr. Tooth).

† 17, Buckingham Street, Strand, W.C., where it has continued ever since under its indefatigable, though ill-supported, chairman, Lord Ebury; and has circulated an immense amount of information on the subject throughout the United Kingdom, not to say the world. (1878.)

examples of Winsor and Macadam. Other persons had noticed that flame might be obtained from coal, but no one before Winsor insisted upon all England adopting gas in place of the old dingy oil lamps of our grandfathers.* Stone had been broken in pieces to mend bad roads before Macadam, but he was the first who made it his business to pull up every pavement in the land, and substitute a noiseless level instead of the previous up-and-down locomotion, compared to which travelling over a newly ploughed field was a luxury. The same might be said of steamboats, railroads, telegraphs, and a hundred other inventions of the century. And the same may be now said of the Revision movement of the present day.

Lord Ebury means to be the Macadam of the Church. He is not the discoverer of the patent, but he has made up his mind to take no denial, and to din and din the subject into the ears of the public, always unwilling to be roused from their slumbers, till at last he shall have produced an impression, and a fair trial be made of his nostrum.

Accordingly the Session of 1862 opens with the following important announcement :—

Two bills have been presented in the House of Lords by Lord Ebury. One of them proposes to amend the law respecting the declaration of assent to the use of the Book of Common Prayer, required of ministers and others of the Established Church, by making it lawful for every person required to make a declaration to do so either according to the form at present in use, or according to the following one: "I, A. B., do declare that the Book of Common Prayer may be lawfully used as such ; [*adding if he be in holy orders*] and that I will myself in public prayers and in administration of the Sacraments use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other."

The other is entitled, "An Act to amend the regulations for the public worship, rites, and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland."

* And now the still more splendid Electric Light seems in a fair way to supersede even gas for general use ! (1878.)

These two bills were read for the first time on the 6th of this month. The latter one is accompanied by a schedule consisting of twenty-one clauses, setting forth numerous alterations in the order and distribution of the services of the Church, with permission to omit, or curtail, certain of the forms now in use ; and the directions in this schedule it is proposed shall henceforth be deemed part of the Book of Common Prayer. The Bill itself is as follows : *—

WHEREAS it is expedient that, without prejudice to the maintenance of General Uniformity in the Public Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, further discretion should be allowed as to the Distribution and Order of Services, and the Use, Omission, or Curtailment, as occasion may require, of some of the prescribed Forms :

Be it therefore enacted, &c. ; as follows :

1. The directions in the Schedule to this Act shall be deemed to form Part of the Book of Common Prayer, and be inserted in the said Book immediately after that part of the prefatory directions therein contained which is intituled “The Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read,” and shall be there printed in every copy of the said Book hereafter printed by authority or with privilege.

2. And whereas doubts have arisen respecting the effect of one of the paragraphs of the Rubric prefixed to the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants in the said Book contained, and it is expedient to remove such doubts : Be it therefore declared and enacted as follows :

Any person shall be admitted to be Godfather or Godmother (as the case may be) for his or her own Child, if he or she desire.

3. And whereas by the Act of Uniformity it is enacted that, at every time when any Sermon or Lecture is to be preached, the Common Prayer and Service in and by the Book of Common Prayer, appointed to be read for that time of the day, shall be publicly read by some Priest or Deacon in the Church, Chapel, or place of Public Worship, where the said Sermon or Lecture is to be preached, before such Sermon or Lecture be preached, and that the Lecturer then to preach

* Presented to the House by Lord Ebury, and ordered to be printed Feb. 6, 1862. In the debate which subsequently took place, the Bishop of Oxford characterised the Bill as “so extravagantly ridiculous that it was *thought by most people to be a practical joke!*” It has been considered, therefore, desirable to reprint the Bill *in extenso*, that the public may judge between the noble lord and the Right Reverend Prelate in this matter.

shall be present at the reading thereof; with a proviso or exception for Public University Sermons or Lectures :

And whereas doubts have arisen as to the effect of the recited enactment, and it is expedient to remove such doubts: Be it therefore declared and enacted as follows :

The said recited enactment shall be deemed to extend only to a Sermon or Lecture preached by a Lecturer, and shall not be deemed to extend to a Sermon or Lecture preached in a Place of Public Worship by the Incumbent of the Benefice to which such place of Public Worship belongs, or by any person being Curate of such Incumbent, or Curate, Chaplain, or Regular Minister of or in such Place of Public Worship, or by a Stipendary Curate actually serving such place of Public Worship.

4. Explains the terms "Act of Uniformity, and Book of Common Prayer," as applied to England and Ireland.

5. This Act shall be construed, as far as may be, together with each of the said two Acts as one Act.

6. This Act may be cited as the Public Worship Act, 1862.

SCHEDULE.

¶ *Directions enjoined to be here added by Act of Parliament, 1862.*

WHEREAS it has seemed expedient that further discretion should be allowed as to the distribution and order of the Services of the Church, and the use, omission, or curtailment, as occasion may require, of some of the forms prescribed in this book: it is therefore directed and ordered as follows :

I.—SUNDAYS AND HOLY-DAYS.

1. On Sundays and other Holy-Days (whether there be a Communion or not) there may be omitted at Morning Service, if the Minister think well, either the Litany, or that part of the office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper which is appointed to be said on all Sundays and other Holy-Days, hereinafter called the Ante-Communion Service.

2. When the Ante-Communion Service is omitted, there shall be declared to the People, immediately after the conclusion of the Order for Morning Prayer, what Holy-Days or Fasting Days are in the week following to be observed; and then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion. Then shall follow the Sermon (if any), concluding with the Blessing.

3. On Sundays and other Holy-Days, when the Ante-Communion Service is said immediately after the Order for Morning Prayer, (whether there be a Communion or not, and whether the Litany be sung or said, or not,) then, if the Minister think well, there may be omitted in the Order for Morning Prayer the Collect for the Day; and

in the Ante-Communion Service, the Lord's Prayer, the Collect for the Queen, and the Creed; or any one or more of these several portions of the forms prescribed.

4. On Sundays and other Holy-Days, when the Litany is sung or said, and the Ante-Communion Service is also said (in manner now accustomed), then, if the Minister think well, there may be omitted in the Order for Morning Prayer so much as comes between the Apostles' Creed and the Litany; and in the Litany so much as begins with the Lord's Prayer and ends with the Prayer immediately preceding that of St. Chrysostom; and in the Order for Morning Prayer and the Ante-Communion Service either of the appointed Creeds; and in the Ante-Communion Service the Lord's Prayer, and the Collect for the Queen; or any one or more of these several portions of the Forms prescribed.

5. On any Sunday or other Holy-Day, when there are said in any Church or Chapel both Morning and Evening Prayer, then, if the Minister think well, instead of Evening Prayer being said twice (in manner now accustomed) there may be used either in the Afternoon or in the Evening such form of Divine Service as may be convenient, and the same shall for all purposes be deemed to be Evening Prayer or Service: provided that nothing shall be said or sung, read or done, in any such Service, by virtue or under colour of the present Direction, except what is contained in or authorised by some part of this Book.

II.—PSALMS AND LESSONS.

6. Where more than one Psalm is appointed, any one or more (but not all) of them may be omitted, if the Minister think well.* (For this purpose each portion of the 119th Psalm to be deemed a Psalm.)

7. A part or parts of any Lesson appointed in the Calendar, or of any proper Lesson assigned for the Day, may be omitted, if the Minister think well.

8. Where any Lesson (including a Proper Lesson) is not taken out of one of the Canonical Books of Holy Scripture, there may be read instead thereof, if the Minister think well, a Lesson taken out of one of the Canonical Books.

9. In the place of any Lesson, not being a Proper Lesson, there may be read, if the Minister think well, any portion of Holy Scripture that may seem specially appropriate to the day. [Provided, that within the week following information thereof shall be given by the Minister to the Ordinary.]

III.—LITANY.

10. On any day, if the Minister think well, the Litany, either including or not so much as begins with the Lord's Prayer and ends

* See before Letter LXXXVI., p. 98, note †.

with the Prayer immediately preceding that of St. Chrysostom, may be sung or said as a separate Service, either before or after the Order for Morning Prayer is said.

11. Except on Sundays and other Holy-Days, and Wednesdays and Fridays, the Litany may, if the Minister think well, be sung or said instead of the Order for Morning Prayer.

12. On any occasion of national or local Trial special mention may be made, if the Minister think well, of such national or local Trial, after the words "whensoever they oppress us," as part of the Prayer in which these words are.

IV.—SPECIAL SERVICES.

13. On any occasion of Public Prayer or Thanksgiving in respect of any national, local, or individual Trial or Mercy, there may be used on any day, not being a Sunday or other Holy-Day, at any time of the day, in any Church or Chapel, if the Minister think well (whether Morning or Evening Prayer be said or not), such Form of Divine Service as may be convenient and specially appropriate: provided, that nothing shall be said or sung, read or done, in any such Service, by virtue or under colour of the present direction, except what is contained in or authorised by some part of this Book: [provided also, that within the week following information thereof shall be given by the Minister to the Ordinary.]

V.—COMMUNION SERVICE.

14. When there is a Communion, with a Sermon, the Order for Morning Prayer and the Litany, or either of them, may be omitted, if the Minister think well.

15. On the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday before Easter, Good Friday, and Easter Even, or any of them, there may be omitted, if the Minister think well, a part or parts of the Epistle (or of the portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle), and of the Gospel or of either of them.

16. A part or parts of the three several Exhortations immediately following the Prayer for the Church Militant may, if the Minister think well, be omitted.

17. When the Minister delivers the consecrated Elements to the People, it shall not be necessary for him to address the appointed Form of Words to each communicant individually; and instead thereof he may address them to the communicants assembled at one time at the Table, collectively, changing the singular into the plural.

VI.—BAPTISM.

18. When the Public Baptism of Infants is administered at Morning or Evening Service there may be omitted, if the Minister thinks well, the first Prayer, the Exhortation upon the words of the Gospel,

with the Prayer immediately following it, the Lord's Prayer, and the whole or part of what follows the words "Profession he hath here made by you," or any one or more of these several portions of the Form prescribed.

VII.—SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY.

19. In the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony there may be omitted, if the Minister think well, a part or parts of the introductory Address, beginning "Dearly beloved," the Form of Words beginning "With this ring," the Psalm, and the whole or part of what follows it, or any one or more of these several portions of the Form prescribed.

VIII.—CHURCHING OF WOMEN.

20. When the Office for the Churching of Women is said at Morning or Evening Service, the Lord's Prayer may be omitted, if the Minister think well.

IX.—COMMINATION.

21. The use of the Office called a Commination shall be left to the discretion of the Minister.

The original draft was accompanied by the following observations pointing out in brief the purport of the Bill:—

The object of this Bill is to amend the existing regulations for the Public Worship, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church, in three respects; namely, as to—

1. The Division, Order, and Details of the Services.
2. The Admission of Parents as Sponsors in Baptism.
3. Preaching without full Service.

1. *The Division, Order, and Details of the Services.*

The alterations proposed all come within what is termed structural revision; no one of them is designed to affect any point of doctrine.

Their general tendency is towards abbreviation of the Services.

There is nothing compulsory in the Bill. The Rubric, as it stands, being in effect confirmed by Act of Parliament, cannot be varied by less authority. A Bill, though completely permissive, is therefore necessary.

The general intention is, as explained by the preamble, to extend to somewhat larger objects and to a greater number of particulars those discretionary powers which are already in many instances vested in the

Clergy by the Rubric, without in the least trenching on the principle of Uniformity. That principle is fully maintained by the limitation of the sphere of selection to the pages of one book, however extensive may be the discretion allowed within those limits.

The Manuscript Book annexed to the Act of 1662 (or a Sealed Book which now represents it) is to be regarded as a Schedule to that Act. It seemed, therefore, proper that the amendments now proposed to be introduced into the Rubric should take the Form of a Schedule to the amending Bill; besides, it is obvious that this arrangement has many incidental advantages.

The whole Schedule is to be considered part of the Book of Common Prayer, as if it had been comprised in the original manuscript volume; and it is to be printed in all copies, after the Preface and the explanations and directions which follow it. A general preliminary Rubric governing all the special ones throughout the Book will thus be provided, and the alterations will be introduced not only in the most convenient shape, but also with the least possible disturbance of the existing provisions.

It is not within the scope of these observations to explain or comment on the Clauses in which the proposed alterations are embodied. And it only remains to observe, under this head, that the terms used in the Rubric have always been employed, as far as possible, and that an endeavour has been made not to depart further than was unavoidable from its style.

2. *The Admission of Parents as Sponsors in Baptism.*

The object of Clause 2 is to remove the obstacle which the Rubric respecting the number of Godfathers and Godmothers has been considered to present to the Adoption of this Reform in the practice of the Church. Such an obstacle cannot be removed by any authority but that of an Act of Parliament.

3. *Preaching without Full Service.*

The difficulty, which Clause 3 is designed to meet, arises not on the Rubric, but on the Act of Uniformity itself. It seems desirable that all ground for the doubt, which operates as restrictively as a positive Enactment, should now be removed.

Such is Lord Ebury's Permissive Bill of 1862, my remarks upon which I must reserve to a future letter.* Meanwhile

Feb. 14, 1862.

Yours, &c.,

“INGOLDSBY.”

* See Letter cxxv., p. 326.

LETTER CXXIV.

LORD EBURY AND THE SATURDAY REVIEW.

"Summa petit livor: perflant altissima venti:

Summa petunt dextrâ fulmina missa Jovis."

OVID.

"Boredom is at a high premium this year. There is absolutely nothing for the Imperial Legislature to do, nothing to legislate for, and bore calls to and encourages his brother bore."—*Saturday Review*, Feb. 22, 1862.

SIR,—Lord Ebury is a most fortunate man. He has been twice at least the object of virulent personal attack; first in the columns of the *Morning Post*, now in the pages of the *Saturday Review*.*

There must be something very formidable about the noble lord to have entitled him to this high distinction, which the poet tells us he shares in common with the loftiest pines, the tallest columns, and the most towering alps.† Men do not use to put a conductor on a cottage or a barn. We may be sure that wherever the Jupiter of the press directs his thunderbolt, there is a foe to be dreaded, or a rival to be humbled. The ancients wisely held the devoted spot as sacred. Wherever the lightning fell, there they erected an altar or a temple. And thus, when he is gone (if not during his lifetime), will the noble lord's memory be enshrined in the hearts of a too late grateful posterity, for having laboured so long at the thankless task of endeavouring to reform the Church.‡

It is all very well for an anonymous writer in the *Saturday*

* Vol. xiii., No. 330, p. 208, Article, "Lord Ebury's Ritual Reforms."

† "Sævius ventis agitur ingens

Pinus: et celsæ graviore casu

Decidunt turres: feriuntque summos

Fulgura montes."

HOR., Od. ii. x.

‡ See Letter LXXVIII., p. 49.

Review * to talk of *Parliamentum terebratum*, or *Parliamentum terebrantium*, the bored Parliament or the Parliament of bores; but it may justly be questioned which is the greater *bore*, a man returned to Parliament to eat the bread of idleness through a whole Session,—

“ Still going blind as Premiers lead him,
And saying aye or no 's they bid him,”—

or a man (whether Commoner or Peer makes small difference) who has the spirit to take up a matter of this importance and make it his own by dint of patient industry and indomitable perseverance. To attempt to set down such men as persons of “but one idea,” is to expose one's own ignorance of the history of all great achievements.† What cause was ever brought to a successful issue but by a man of one idea? —What was Luther, but a man of one idea? What Oliver Cromwell? What Richard Cobden? Does the Saturday Reviewer think the Corn Laws would ever have been repealed, had the question been identified with more than one name? What is every one's business is proverbially no one's business. Lord Ebury has made it his business to bring about a reform of the Prayer-book,—yes, to reform the reformed Prayer-book,‡—and he will reform it, in spite of all the thunders of the *Morning Post* and *Saturday Review*.

But does the Prayer-book want reforming? Is not everybody satisfied with the Book of 1662? or, as the

* The article was generally attributed to Mr. Alexander Beresford Hope, reputed author of “The Church Cause and the Church Party.” Letter LXXVIII., p. 46.

† It was one of Disraeli's pithy sayings that “All great triumphs owe their origin to a minority.”

‡ We have now (1878) got a “Reformed Prayer-book” in use by a “Reformed Episcopal Church.” This is what it is to resist timely Reforms, till the Reformers learn to help themselves.

Reviewer charitably puts it, has the Book which has sufficed for exactly two centuries, been only awaiting its Ebury all this time?*

We are not going to argue this point in a single Letter ; and to give our reasons at length why to our mind the Prayer-book does require amendment ; and why we think the public are *not* satisfied with the Book as it is. Suffice it to point to the fact that upwards of a hundred pamphlets have been published within the last five years calling for its Revision, to which we would refer any one who may be sceptical as to the existence of such a demand. But one argument is irresistible ;—that, notwithstanding the princely endowments of the Establishment, the power and advantages it confers on those who belong to it, the injury and discredit attaching in many cases to those who are estranged from it, while no gain whatever that we know of belongs exclusively to the side of Dissent, yet it can hardly be denied by the Saturday Reviewer that the Nonconformists, in some shape or other, outweigh in numbers, or nicely balance, the members of the Church.† Surely such a state of things points to *something* wrong, and calls for some remedy ; and we are at a loss to know what better object could at this moment

* We would answer the Reviewer in the words of a critic who used his powerful pen to *promote*, not to *resist*, rational reforms.

“What human plan, device, or invention (says the admirable Sydney Smith), 200 years old, does not require reconsideration? If a man dressed now as his forefathers dressed 200 years ago, the pug-dogs in the streets would tear him to pieces. If he lived in the houses of 200 years ago, unrevised and uncorrected, he would die of rheumatism in a week. If he listened to the sermons of 200 years ago, he would perish with sadness and fatigue; and when a man cannot make a coat or a cheese for years together without making them better, can it be said that laws made in those days of ignorance, and framed in the fury of religious hatred, need no revision, and are capable of no amendment?”—*Edinburgh Review*, 1827.

† On this disputed point see Remarks at Letter LXXXI., pp. 62-3; with reference to the Census, and Statistics of Religious Sects.

engage the attention of the great Council of the nation now assembled in Parliament, especially as, according to the Reviewer's own showing, it happens at present (a rare occurrence) to have nothing else to do.*

To this object, accordingly, Lord Ebury has addressed himself; and, though not supported as he ought to be, he has been resisted seriously by no one that we have heard of except the Bishop of Oxford. That his two Bills now before Parliament are not perhaps the best that could be framed, is not the fault of the noble lord. He has again and again expressed his readiness to hand the matter over to the Bishops. He has twice asked for a Royal Commission to undertake the task. Foiled in both these attempts, he now submits two measures to the judgment of Parliament and the country. The object of the one, which even the Saturday Reviewer does not seem to impugn, is to relax the present rigid form of Subscription;† the object of the other is to give relief to the officiating clergyman and his flock

* Archdeacon Denison, on the other hand, considers Parliament the very last authority in the kingdom to which the subject of Revision of the Prayer-book should be entrusted. See his somewhat fierce remarks in his lately published Autobiography, Chap. x., p. 362. "Carry the Prayer-book into Parliament, and in the natural order of things it will not come out the same Prayer-book. Will it come out a better book? The advocates of legislation say, 'Yes.' Upon what ground I have tried hard to understand, but find it every way impossible. I believe that it *must necessarily come out a very damaged Book*. The Anglo-Catholic does not think the Prayer-book incapable of improvement; he desiderates many things in it: but he is content to work with what he has got, to *watch and wait*,* because he finds in it the foundations of Catholic Faith and Worship.† Once carry the Book into Parliament, and a large part of these will disappear." (And Peace be with them, and the Church! 1878.)

† This important point was subsequently yielded by "the Powers that be," on the recommendation of a numerous Commission, and made the basis of useful Legislation:—but why stop there?

* Till he sees the opportunity of making it more Romish than it now is, we presume.

† Those germs of Romanism, so unfortunately left behind at the Reformation, and which have been the breeding-ground of disturbance in the Church ever since.

in the performance of public worship. It is doubtless very witty to cut jokes upon the fidgety habits of Masters Grosvenor major and Grosvenor minor; but it is not school-boys alone, but potent, grave, and intelligent senators, lawyers, physicians, yes, and even deans and bishops, who have complained, and still complain, of our lengthy and tautological services. In answer to this complaint, Lord Ebury proposes a scheme which (to humour the Bishop of Oxford's crotchet) will not *touch* the Prayer-book, but will keep everything there exactly as it now is. It will leave, too, the Ten Thousand, who signed the celebrated clerical manifesto, at liberty to go along in the old path for the term of their natural lives to their own great satisfaction, and the no small discomfort of their flocks. But it also gives permission (and only permission) to those of the clergy, who judge that a little variety in the services might be acceptable to their people, to make such variation, within moderate and strictly defined limits.

The chief objection we have to the Bill, as it now stands, is, that before any clerk can avail himself of some of its clauses he must obtain the sanction of his Bishop! We should have expected such a condition to have recommended the measure to the Saturday Reviewer; but we are mistaken; his Momus spirit condescends to carp at even the slippers of Lord Ebury. The Reviewer thinks (and here we entirely agree with him) that the Bishops will hardly thank his lordship for this last ounce added to their already overweighted back. We hope, therefore, Lord Ebury will take the hint, and erase that most superfluous and objectionable clause from the Bill before it is offered for a second reading.*

The Bishops either have, or are presumed to have, something else to do with their time, than to be receiving and

* The passages objected to (for this reason) are inclosed in brackets, pp. 316, 317; but were ultimately withdrawn from the Bill.

answering letters week by week as to whether their clergy have varied the lesson of the day upon sufficient grounds. Let them assume that the clergy sometimes know better than their lordships the peculiar wants and tastes of their congregations.* They often enough already take liberties with the service without consulting their diocesan, and will continue to do so to the end of time, whether Lord Ebury’s bill passes or not.† We hope, therefore, it will not be encumbered by a restriction, which would be simply inoperative from the outset, or (as usual in such cases) operate only as a burden to the weak, while it would be wholly disregarded by the strong. With this exception, we heartily wish success to the principle of the bill; and are content to leave the details to the judgment of men as wise as, and more charitable than, the writer of the article in the *Saturday Review*.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

March 6, 1862.

“INGOLDSBY.”

* “The Bishops know, and can know, but very little about any individual parish, when one remembers how they are engaged. I believe the Bishop of London knows no more of any particular district in my parish than he does of the streets of Timbuctoo.” (The Rev. W. Acworth’s evidence before Committee on the Ecclesiastical Commission, May 30, 1862, p. 157.)

† The Author has taken this liberty for the last twenty years, very much to the satisfaction of his hearers, and purposes doing so for the remainder of his earthly career, Bishops and Acts of Uniformity notwithstanding. Archbishop Musgrave was once asked by a friend of the Author’s to sanction some trifling deviation from the prescribed order of the Church Service. The Archbishop’s sensible reply was, “Do what you please, but don’t ask me.” On another similar occasion, when permission *was refused*, the following parody of a well-known passage in Shakspeare was sent to the *Rock* by the Author of these Letters, and there published, May 23, 1873:—

“WHY did the Incumbent ask the Bishop’s leave?—

Had he not asked, he had not been refused.

Why should the Bishop be a tyrant then?—

Poor man! I know he would not be a wolf,

But that he sees his clergy are but sheep.

He were no lion were not Parsons hinds.”

—JULIUS CÆSAR, *Act I., Scene 3.*

LETTER CXXV.

THE PERMISSIVE BILL OF 1862.

“When I hear a man talk of an unalterable law, the only effect it produces on me is to convince me that he is an unalterable fool.”

P. PLYMLEY'S LETTERS.

SIR,—As I find that other persons besides the Saturday Reviewer have either misunderstood, or misrepresented the object of, Lord Ebury's Public Worship Bill, read for the first time last month, you will perhaps allow me to detail, according to my promise,* what I conceive would be the effect and the advantage of some such a measure receiving the sanction of the Imperial Legislature.

Omitting the preamble, I will confine myself to the Schedule annexed to the Bill, forming, as it does, the germ of the whole. Even so I must trespass somewhat on the patience of my readers, seeing the Schedule contains not less than twenty-one propositions, great and small.

§§ 1, 2, 3.† The object of these is simply to shorten the usual Sunday morning service, while their occasional adoption would tend to mitigate the evil arising from the unvarying routine of our present system.

§ 4. By this section, as it stood in the original draft, it was proposed to omit a portion of the introductory exhortation, “Dearly beloved brethren.”—We regret to see this suggestion withdrawn from the Bill. There is perhaps no part of the service that so palls upon the ear as this tautological piece of composition of a bygone age.‡ It is needless to say it formed no part of the early Liturgies. The section

* Letter cxxiii., p. 319.

† Letter cxxiii., p. 315.

‡ See an able article on this subject in the *Broad Churchman*, March 20, 1873. Vol. i., No. 8, p. 226. S, Bouverie Street, E.C.

as it now stands is devoted to suggesting other omissions with a view to abridging the length of the present service.

It must be borne in mind that a Committee of Convocation not long ago recommended the division of this threefold service, so that its several parts might be used at different hours. But it is notorious that such division is all but impossible in country places, and not always convenient in towns, when the church is under the care of but one minister, or even two. Where, then, the full service is read, why should not one creed suffice? Why not one Prayer for the Queen? Why not one reading of the Collect for the day? Why should the Lord's Prayer be repeated four or five times within the hour? Does no one feel that this divine prayer suffers by this constant repetition? Or are we to hold with Wheatley, that this repetition has its advantages in this, "that if we did not put up any petition of it with fervency enough before, we may make amends for it now, by asking that with a double earnestness."* Why, as the Reverend Ashton Oxenden well observed in Convocation,† this is to put a premium upon inattention. By the same rule every prayer, every Creed, and indeed every Psalm or hymn should be recited three or four times over to ensure due attention to its several clauses. Away, then, for ever with this argument, on the refutation of which far too much time and breath has been already expended.

§ 5, While leaving the present Morning and Evening Service entirely undisturbed,—if any one will have it so,—gives permission (and only permission) to construct a third Service, out of the Prayer-book, at the discretion of the Minister, in order to avoid the monotony to himself, as well as to his congregation, of three times repeating in great

* See before, Letter ciii., p. 186-7.

† Speech on the Dean of Norwich's motion, February, 1861.

measure a form of words already used in the course of the day. Surely this is the most harmless of all the recommendations of this Bill,—yet it has not escaped censure.

§ 6. Neither has this—whereby permission is given, “when more than one Psalm is appointed to be read, to omit one or more, but not all.” It sometimes happens that most incongruous Psalms are thrown together by the present arrangement; a Psalm, for instance, of thanksgiving, followed by a penitential one; or *vice versâ*. In the American Prayer-book a selection is made by which this incongruity is avoided, and shorter portions offered for occasional use. A variation of the Psalms for a third Service (in some churches) is absolutely required.*

§ 7. Gives permission to omit part or parts of the Lesson of the day. It is needless to observe that this is already constantly done; all that is here asked is legal sanction for the practice. The existing Calendar gives frequent instances of such omission, and would be greatly improved by a further extension of the principle.†

§ 8. Sanctions the substitution of the Canonical Scripture in place of the Apocrypha, but does not compel it. Nothing in this Schedule is compulsory; and surely here, if anywhere, an *option* might be fairly conceded.

§ 9. Until the entire Calendar is revised by authority, some such permission as this is highly desirable on occasion—say, for example, at harvest homes, club feasts, Church openings, and the like. The concluding provision, however, that information thereof must be sent to the Ordinary,‡

* This has been done by a careful re-arrangement of the Psalter, with this object in view, by the Prayer-book Revision Association, 17, Buckingham Street. (1878.)

† The “New Lectionary” has all but removed this objection to the old Calendar of Lessons; but more liberty might still be granted. (1878.)

‡ See last Letter, p. 324-5.

would be found in practice so utterly inoperative and vexatious, and borders so closely on the absurd, that we cannot conceive it will be ever adopted by the Legislature.

§ 12, Has been subjected to what Bishop Thirlwall calls "coarse insinuation and misplaced ridicule;" but it is by no means likely that the permission, if granted, would be abused, and if not, it would frequently be of service in calling attention to passing events, eminently deserving of present and earnest prayer. The American war now raging, which the Bishop of Oxford in vain attempted to introduce as the subject of prayer (even by a pause in the service), is a case in point, and similar ones are continually arising.

§ 13. The principle of Special Services has already received the sanction of Convocation. We again, however, protest against the annexed condition of sending notice to the Ordinary. With every respect for the bishops in general, we cannot for a moment believe they would wish to be burdened with such a petty power of interfering with the liberty of the clergy; and if they did, sure we are that the strong would, as usual, neglect to comply with so peddling and meddling a requirement.

§ 14. It is certain that the number of Communicants is materially affected by the length of the previous service. It would seem, therefore, highly desirable that, where the service cannot be conveniently divided, some liberty of omission (like that suggested in this section) should be sanctioned, especially about Easter-tide.

§ 15. A large portion of the Prayer-book is occupied by whole chapters relating to our Lord's Passion, accessible now-a-days to every one in their New Testaments and "Church Services." If selected portions of fifteen or twenty verses were appointed to be read on the days referred to in this section, instead of entire chapters, the several events of the holy week might be exhibited in orderly succession, and

the confusion arising from the present repetition be avoided, while the events themselves would be made more impressive on the congregation by their appropriateness to the day. Incidentally an advantage would accrue by the saving of considerable space (in this Hand-book of devotion), which might be profitably applied to the introduction of Special Services, Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, an authorised Hymnal, Prayers for Domestic Use, and the like.

§ 16. Of the Three Exhortations, it is notorious that in practice only part of the first is commonly read. The second is rarely or never used at all, a hortatory sermon being found in these days better adapted for the purpose. With regard to the third, it contains much that is ill-suited to those who have already decided on offering themselves as communicants, while the expression "eating and drinking their own damnation" is stronger than is warranted by the original text, and often, it is to be feared, defeats its own end.

§ 17. The mode of distributing the elements continually varies according to the fancy of the minister and the nature of the congregation. This section is therefore only sanctioning by law what is now done without law. Perhaps the most convenient and solemn mode of administering the bread and wine, where there are several recipients, is, to address the former part of the sentence in the *plural* to the *collected* rail, the latter ("Take, &c.") in the *singular* to *each individual* in his turn.*

§ 18. Unless the baptismal difficulty is to remain a perpetual bar to a wider comprehension within the Church, I know of no better way than that here suggested for meeting the feelings of all parties. They who hold the extremest

* And here it may be noted that the Ritualistic practice of receiving the bread in crossed palms is in distinct violation of the expression "Take, eat," and without any authority whatever from Scripture.

views of the rite might thus continue to use the entire service as it now stands ; while they who cannot conscientiously hold such views (and they are notoriously a large number) would not be debarred from Church membership, but might meet on the common ground of “agreeing to differ.” It is clear some such middle course will one day have to be adopted, as the best way of reconciling the legal with the theoretical interpretation of this deep and intricate subject. The only alternative appears to be war to the knife, to the great scandal of religion, and serious detriment of the Church.

§ 19. In the Solemnization of Matrimony there is not one clergyman in a hundred who does not already take some liberties with the service. Nowhere is the *permission to omit* more needed than here.

§§ 20, 21. The expediency of these suggestions seems hardly to require a comment. The Communion—like the Exhortation at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, at Confirmation, and before the Communion, the Homily at Matrimony, and the Address to Godfathers and Godmothers at Baptism,—is part of the system of an age when preaching and expounding Scripture, and teaching in Sunday-schools, were things comparatively rare. They suppose a degree of ignorance of the first elements of religion which would now-a-days discredit the veriest tyro in the Christian faith.

I have thus brought to an end, as briefly as was consistent with the necessity of the case, the observations which it occurs to me to make on this much-canvassed Bill. I see in it nothing but good intention, and what I believe would prove good if brought into action. That others hold an opposite opinion, I am well aware ; but as nothing serious has as yet been offered in the way of refutation, I do not despair of seeing some such measure one day forming part and parcel of the law of the land.

I am, yours, &c.,

March 20, 1862.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXXVI.

LORD EBURY AND THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY, MAY 27, 1862.

“Unam minimamque relinque:—

De multis minimam posco, clamavit, et unam.”—OVID.

“The noble lord, having minimised the alterations he proposed, now brings forward a bill on which he does not dare to take a division.”

BISHOP OF OXFORD (WILBERFORCE).

SIR,—’Tis done. The great debate is over; and the question of a present Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, or, which amounts to the same thing, any modification of the oppressive Act of Uniformity, does not appear to meet with the approbation of Parliament, or at least of the House of Lords. The bishops are against it; and Government is not at this moment strong enough to set the bishops at defiance. The Wisdom of our Ancestors, notwithstanding all the cutting sarcasm of the inimitable Sydney Smith, is still the watchword with the majority of the Upper House. The Church and the world are pronounced to be no wiser in 1862 than they were two centuries ago. The experience of two hundred years, the progress made by printing, postage, telegraphs, and railways, has done nothing to open our eyes, or enlarge our understanding;—it is considered impossible to improve upon the Act of 1662;*—“the thing that hath been, is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which

* An original writer speaks of this Act as follows:—

“Let not things indifferent cause so much difference. Let there be no such Act of Uniformity as to cause deformity. Take away such unnecessary terms of union as breed divisions. Lord, grant to England’s rulers a spirit of wisdom to know and heal our distempers, and unite their hearts to heal our breaches.”—*Rev. Robert Meeke’s Diary*, Nov. 25, 1690.

Who can say how much of the present power of Dissent might not have been broken had this wise and truly Christian prayer been acted on by the Statesmen and Parliament under William III.? And is it still too late?

shall be done :”—so at least say the Sheldons and the Morleys of this our day.

Under the pressure of some influence, we know not what, Lord Ebury has been induced to give up his Permissive Bill altogether, and to reduce his present application to Parliament to—what the Bishop of Oxford is pleased to call—a “most minute, perplexing, insignificant, useless, and therefore mischievous relaxation of one particular clause in the Act of Uniformity.” Like Niobe in the fable, the noble lord has seen all the elder and stronger members of his Revision family pierced to the heart by the ruthless Archer of Cuddesdon ;—one by one he has witnessed fall prostrate before his feet, baptismal regeneration, priestly absolution, the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, the amendment of the Calendar, abridgment of the Services,—and he clings with all a mother’s fondness to his little one,—the last and the least, —and cries piercingly with the patriarch, “Is it not a little one?”—but he cries in vain. The bow is bent, the ruthless shaft is sped, and the distracted parent is left weeping in perpetual stone.

One advantage, however, has resulted from the decision of the House of Lords on this occasion. It is an ill wind, they say, that blows no one any good ; and the stormy debate of last night has brought luck to the door of the Author of these Letters. “Ingoldsby” may spare himself any further trouble. He may husband his eye-sight, and reduce his weekly expenditure of midnight oil. His occupation is gone. His talk may now be of bullocks and of fatlings. It would be *et oleum et operam perdere* to pursue his task of the past five years any further. If the public are not to be convinced by the arguments of last evening, they are beyond reclaim. With Ephraim of old, they are “joined to their idols,” and we are bid to “let them alone,” and shall obey.

One or two remarks, notwithstanding, may be allowed us

in thus taking leave of the too indulgent public. We are fain to believe that neither the noble lord nor ourselves have altogether laboured in vain. The debate of yesterday, however unproductive of any immediate result, is a manifest advance upon any we have had occasion previously to notice. It differs from all former ones in having brought new actors on the stage, in the shape of Earls Russell and Shaftesbury,—characters whose lightest word will have weight with the country, and whose words on this occasion, though light, were not on the side hostile to the motion before the House. On the other hand, the feeble logic of Dungannon* acted as a powerful foil to every point urged by the noble mover,—an advantage he never enjoyed before.

Canterbury (Sumner), being this time absent from ill health, left the field open for York (Longley) to speak out, had he been so minded. His Grace preferred silence, and stands therefore happily uncommitted on a question in which he will one day, probably, have to bear a leading part.† London (Tait) spoke as usual on both sides, but more favourably to the question than heretofore. Oxford (Wilberforce), by more than his wonted energy, both in language and gesticulation, worked hard, like an unscrupulous advocate, to make up by bluster for what was wanting in argument. To do his lordship justice, he raised the cry of *Mumbo Jumbo* to perfection, by which the House was frightened out of its propriety, and Lord Ebury very prudently, under such a panic, declined to divide it. And so the question is put to rest for at least another twelvemonth. The celebrated Bicentenary of 1662 is to be honoured by the Dissenters alone,‡

* Died shortly after this;—remembered only, if at all, as having lifted up his voice in opposition to Lord Ebury's motion on May 27, 1862.

† And did so; to the best, it is believed, of his ability. (1878.)

‡ Who raised on the occasion £200,000 for the purpose of building fresh places of schismatical worship all over the kingdom.

while Churchmen (like Archdeacon Denison and A. J. B. Hope, Esq., M.P.) chuckle that all things are to go on exactly as they are for the term of their natural lives. Their *aræ et foci* are renewed to them for a lease of another 100 years.—“Peace in our time” is still the whispered comfort from ear to ear in the highest ecclesiastical quarters. No matter who suffers, who is annoyed, who stifles the pangs of conscience, who painfully resigns his preferment,—what younger son gives the preference to the army, the navy, the civil engineers, the clerk’s office, the merchant’s counter,—to any thing, every thing, rather than the Church.* The cry jubilant has gone forth, “Lord Ebury is beaten again”—and that alone is cause enough for a shout and song of triumph along the whole length of the line.

But hear a word, ye wise ones (in parting), from one who rarely spoke or wrote in vain. Being once asked, which was the most proper time for removing a nuisance, Sydney Smith replied, “The properest time is that when a man can be found to propose the removal of it. There is then a fair prospect of the thing being done well, because done at the right time. Whereas the history of human nature is so opposite to this, that almost all improvements are made after the bitterest resistance, and consequently in the midst of tumult and violence,—the very worst period at which they can be made; *compared to which any period is eligible*, and should be seized with avidity.”

That the so-called *friends* of the Church, by resisting the present wholesome movement, are reserving her for some future period of severe trial, all past experience would seem to indicate. They rejoice in her momentary escape from the hands of the reformer. She refuses to take physie, and will rather die of her dignity than submit to be healed. The too

* See Letter cxxxiii., on the supply of candidates for Holy Orders.

propitious gods have heard the prayers of the enemy within her pale. She has only to revel in one more such victory in order to be effectually undone.

I remain, yours, &c.,

May 28, 1862.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXXVII.

CHARGES OF THE BISHOPS OF WORCESTER AND LONDON, 1862.

“I never thought to hear you speak again.”—SHAKSP., *Henry IV.*

SIR,—Some months have elapsed since I last addressed you on the subject of Revision. Indeed, after the debate of May 27th, and the apathy with which the motion of that night appeared to be received by the House of Lords, I had made up my mind to give up all present agitation of the question, under the conviction that the fates were adverse, and that there was no use striving any longer against destiny.*

I am roused, however, to one more effort by the recent publication of two Episcopal Charges bearing directly on the subject, and more or less in support of it. I mean those of the Bishops of Worcester and of London.

The Bishop of Worcester (Philpott) is a man of such well-known moderation, and so unattached to either party in the Church, that a word from him in this matter should go a great way. Accordingly it is satisfactory to hear his lordship saying in his late Charge,† that, though he should have

* See last Letter, p. 333. “What’s t’use?”—as the rustic lad said of taking off his cap to the Rector.

“Dii me terrent, et Jupiter hostis.”

† A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Worcester, August, 1862, by Henry, Lord Bishop of Worcester. Bell and Daldy. Pp. 48—53.

regretted had the particular Bill of last Session to amend the Act of Uniformity received the sanction of the Legislature, yet it might be that the form of words in which assent is required to be given is justly open to objection.

“The times,” observes the Bishop, “in which we live are happily different from those in which the Act of 1662 was framed ; and if we had to compose the form anew, we might find words sufficient for the desired purpose, yet less exacting than the unfeigned Assent and Consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer.”

The Bishop’s remarks on the probable effect of the proposed Bill of 1862 are so just and simple, that a further extract from the Charge may be permitted :—

“If good men feel conscientious scruples, it is not easy to see how they could have been removed by the proposed Act, unless it had been followed up by other measures. No honest minister of the Church could declare his intention of conforming to the Liturgy, unless he could also give to it his unfeigned assent. His scruples as to the truth of the substance of the book, or as to the rules prescribed for the use of it, could not have been removed by the withdrawal of one declaration, while the other was to remain in force.

“It is said that some of the Rubrics prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer are obsolete and impracticable. Conscientious men have been troubled by scruples, whether they ought to express their unfeigned assent, or promise to conform to a book in which such rules are found. It would give little relief to such persons to be told that they need no longer express their *assent* to what is prescribed, but that they must still promise to *conform* to what they believe to be inexpedient or impracticable. I acknowledge, in its full force, the difficulty which arises from the existence of such rules, though I believe that difficulty to have been in many

cases exaggerated. It applies equally to both the declarations imposed by the Acts of Uniformity. *There is no way, as far as I can see, of getting rid of that difficulty, other than by revising and altering the rules upon which the difficulty arises. No other course can bring the relief which is desired, and make those who have felt the difficulty, whether among the ministers of our Church, or among those who are about to enter into the ministry, not only ready to declare their intention of conforming to the Liturgy, but glad to express their unfeigned assent to it also. It is much to be wished that some means should be found of bringing about a safe and satisfactory change in the matters to which I have referred.*

“The Bill was withdrawn on the ground that more time than the promoters of it had given was wanted for the consideration of a measure of so much importance. There was, however, a general understanding that the matter would not be allowed to sleep, and there can be no doubt that some of the questions to which the presentation of the Bill gave rise will be brought forward again and pressed upon the Legislature for solution. In the meantime it was considered that what had been said would have the effect of calling the attention of the country to the subject, and draw forth the expression of matured opinion upon it.”

With the above sentiments it is needless to say how cordially the Author of these Letters concurs. The whole tenor of his remarks, extending now over five years, has pointed to a Royal Commission as the only solution of the admitted difficulty, as well as the necessity, of the case;*—nor does he see any reason now to alter his opinion. Nothing but the issue of such a Commission could effectually carry out the *preliminary steps* towards the consummation recommended by the bishop; it is to be hoped, therefore, his

* The Author's idea of what such a Commission should consist of, will be seen by reference to Postscript to Letter cxxviii., p. 348.

lordship would support such a proposition, should it again (as is far from improbable) be brought in a substantive form before Parliament.

The Bishop of London (Tait) in his Charge * enters largely into the question of a Revision of the Prayer-book, with reference to those who are either completely separated from us, or who, without being distinctly hostile, are allied to some other communion.

“If a few passages,” says his lordship, “can be specified in our formularies which might be expunged or altered without wounding the feelings or convictions of any, the alteration of which would make the Church of England no less powerful a witness than it is at present for Christ’s truth, while it would bring many to our communion who are now estranged from it, no fair man will maintain that we should be justified in resisting so reasonable a demand. We must not, however, hastily conclude that such an alteration of our formularies is possible.”

The bishop has still before his eyes the surgical operation alluded to in a former Letter. He recurs painfully to his favourite metaphor taken from the Dublin anatomical schools.—“It has been well said that an excision must leave a scar, and therefore a revised Prayer-book, in which nothing has been altered except by omission, may leave many blanks lamented by devout worshippers.”†

We thought we had sufficiently met this *argumentum à cultro* already. But doubtless the Bishop of London (like the Bishop of Oxford and most other Bishops) has his hands far too full to find time to read the Ingoldsby Letters. Nor does it by any means follow that if he had the time he would be

* A Charge delivered in Dec., 1862, to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, by Archibald Campbell, Lord Bishop of London. Murray. Pp. 39—49.

† Bishop of London’s Charge, p. 42. See before, Letter xci., p. 121.

convinced by them.* Nevertheless, we adhere to our former position, which is simply this, that if there are blemishes in the Prayer-book (of whatever description, doctrinal or otherwise), they ought to be removed, be the consequences what they might. *Fiat justitia—ruat cælum.* We never yet knew the skies to fall upon any salutary reform being attempted, and we do not anticipate such a catastrophe now. Many devout and pious worshippers had their feelings hurt, and lamented sundry blanks, in the days when Luther, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer enunciated their reforms, and applied the scalping knife with no sparing hand;—and though we may now-a-days lack the guiding head of a Cranmer, or the firm hand of a Luther in the performance of the operation, we have the enormous advantage of three hundred years' additional civilisation, which *ought* to have produced artists competent to deal with the case, if only due pains were taken to search them out, and utilise their services.

The question, however, to which the Bishop of London principally addresses himself, is that of clerical subscription,† and he furnishes a valuable paper in the appendix to his Charge, showing in a tabular form all that the clerical mind has to undergo before it can be in a position to instruct others in the great outlines of our faith. The Bishop of London is a man who thinks for himself; but he shows a degree of hesitation, which we should not have anticipated from such a character, when he comes to *speak* his thoughts. The question we should very much like to put to the Bishop, after a careful perusal of all that he has written on this intricate question of subscription, is this—Does his lordship's experience of life in

* As subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury, he might have done much to assist the movement, whereas hitherto he has done little or nothing. (1878.)

† An able work on this subject appeared about this time, entitled, "An Inquiry into the Real Position of the Church and the Clergy in reference to the Articles, the Liturgy, the Canons and Statutes." By the Rev. C. Hebert, M.A., late Rector of Burslem. Macmillan: 1862.

this stirring age, and the various stages through which he has passed—as student at Edinburgh, fellow and tutor at Oxford, head master of Rugby, Dean of Carlisle, and now for six years Bishop of the important diocese over which he presides—lead him to the conclusion that the average of young men, of the age of three or four-and-twenty, are in a condition to have so patiently studied the multifarious contents of the Book of Common Prayer (including the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion), as to be able honestly and *ex animo* to say, “I, A.B., do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by this book?”

Was the Bishop himself in such a condition at the time of his ordination, or when he was presented to his first preferment? Does he believe that one man in fifty is now in such a condition, or ever will be? Does he allow nothing for afterthought, for more matured views,—for subsequent reading and discussion among friends? Is the mind so settled at the age of twenty-three that it requires no further confirmation, admits of no greater enlightenment?—If the Bishop is of that opinion, why not add to the form of subscription words to the following effect:—

“And I, A. B., do hereby solemnly declare that I will never from this day forth open the said Book of Common Prayer for any other purpose than to read it aloud in my public ministration, nor will I from henceforth on any pretext whatever review any one of the said Articles of Religion with the design of satisfying myself that they are all and singular, as I now profess, in strict accordance with the Word of God.” *

* “If the popular theory of subscription be true, and the Articles are articles of belief, a reasonable human being, when little more than a boy pledges himself to a long series of intricate and highly difficult propositions of abstruse divinity. He undertakes never to waver or doubt, never to allow his mind to be shaken, whatever the weight of argument or evidence brought to bear upon him. That is to say, he promises to do what no man living has

If, on the other hand, the Bishop thinks that some liberty of inquiry should be allowed to advancing years and increasing intelligence, and that to deny it would be depriving the clergy of the highest privilege of which they are capable; is it not arbitrary in the last degree for them to be met, as they so frequently are, with the taunt,—What business have you to inquire? you have nothing to do with research; you have given your “unfeigned assent and consent” to all and everything once for all, and there’s an end of it.*

In the earnest hope that this branch at least, if no other, of the Revision question, is on the eve of being entertained by the authorities in some form or other,†

I remain, yours, &c.,

Dec. 20, 1862.

“INGOLDSBY.”

a right to promise.” [I should add, “or no man living has a right to demand.”] (Froude on “Free Discussion;” *Fraser’s Magazine*, 1863.)

* It has been well remarked in reference to this early subscription—“If the formularies of our Church be true and vital, may not men, likely to seek God’s work from choice, be trusted to abide in them? If they be doubtful or false, what a danger or what a sin is risked in forcing them upon the neophyte, by stereotyping in the space of his signature the belief of his life.”—*Daily Telegraph*, Feb. 12, 1863.

† In reference to this subject, the following, from a Provincial paper of the time, is well worth preserving:—“It might have been expected that the powerful speeches of Lord Ebury and the Bishop of London would have produced a greater impression on the Peers. But sometimes events compel, where argument fails to persuade. Let the declaration of unfeigned assent be brought a little more into contempt by the frequent and flagrant violation of it on the one hand, and injurious operation on the other; let the young men of our Universities continue to shun a profession which imposes such a tax upon the conscience; let Dissent go on increasing as it has done; above all, let the Bishop of Oxford make a few more damaging speeches in defence of existing abuses; and our rulers will be obliged both to revise the Prayer-book and to amend the Act of Uniformity. The Established Church cannot afford much longer to carry weight in the race. She is hard pressed to hold her own even now. She is straining every nerve, both as regards the zeal of her clergy and the liberality of her laymen. But, with all her efforts, in Ireland she is already outnumbered by Protestant Dissenters; in England she will soon be overtaken.”—R. M. Woods, *Whittington*, May 25, 1863.

LETTER CXXVIII.

RETROSPECT OF REVISION FROM 1858 TO 1863, AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE.

"Jamque opus exegi."—OVID.

"My very chains and I grew friends;
So much a long communion tends
To make us what we are,—e'en I
Regained my freedom with a sigh."—BYRON.

SIR,—It has been truly observed that no one ever did anything, however trifling, for the last time without regret. The Prisoner of Chillon bid good-bye with reluctance to his spiders and his mice. A bishop delivers with tearful eyes his last Charge. A schoolmaster lays by his ferule with as severe a pang as was ever experienced by the breech on which it may have chanced to fall. And so is it with "Ingoldsby" in taking his leave of yourself and the indulgent public who have so long borne with his garrulity.* The time has arrived when he must make his bow.† Lord Elbury has once more renewed his notice of motion in the House of Lords for a Revision of the Act of Uniformity ‡—the old tale over again.

* Let us hope *not* "the harebrained chatter of irresponsible frivolity." (Lord Beaconsfield, at the Mansion House, Nov. 9, 1878.)

† The Author was earnestly solicited from several quarters to continue the Letters; but he was fairly wearied of his five years' fruitless effort to open the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf.

‡ The Bill proposed to repeal so much of the Acts of Uniformity as require ecclesiastical functionaries to "declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer." But it left untouched the clause which obliges such persons to declare "that they will conform to the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as is now by law established."

It further proposed to declare, that the enactment which requires that

—It is clear, therefore, “Ingoldsby” has at least another year’s labour before him, or he must strike sail at once—which, as the lesser of two evils, he prefers to do.

It is due, however, to the cause which he thus resigns into other hands, due to the noble lord who is still in possession of the field, and due lastly to himself, as the Author of these Letters (now for the first time published in a collective form), that he should exhibit somewhat of the progress made by the Revision question in the course of the past five years, during which the agitation has been sustained.

Let any dispassionate person take into account the public information, public interest, and public excitement upon this subject in February, 1863, as compared with what they were in February, 1858, when the Bishop of Oxford pronounced his dictum that “it would be well that the Church should know that the desire of the bishops of the Church at this time, quite uninfluenced by their own peculiar views of truth, is to keep, as one of God’s special gifts to us, UNTOUCHED and UNALTERED, our Book of Common Prayer.”*

Is there a Bishop or Archbishop on the bench who would dare to say as much now?—Is there a Bishop or Archbishop that *could* say as much now with truth?—Is it not a convincing proof of the progress made by the agitation, that the

Morning or Evening Prayer be read before the preaching a sermon or lecture, and that the lecturer be present at the reading thereof, is to be deemed to extend only to the case of a sermon or lecture preached by a lecturer properly so called, and not to a sermon preached by the incumbent or his curate.

The bill was read for the first time in the House of Lords, Feb. 5th, 1863. At the same time the noble lord gave notice that he should move an humble address to Her Majesty, praying for the appointment of a Commission to consider “what steps should be taken to obviate the evils complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate use of the burial service of the Church of England.” The debate and division on the second reading took place May 19, 1863; see p. 346, Note*.

* Bishop of Oxford in Convocation, Feb., 1858. See Vol. I., p. 97.

Bench is at this moment notoriously divided in opinion on the subject? Is there a public journal now to be met with that ventures openly to defend the state of things as they are?—Is there an individual that will come forward, and throw down the gage in behalf of the Prayer-book as it is, “untouched and unaltered?” We stand corrected.—Two individuals have done so within this present year. They are the Very Reverend Dean Close of Carlisle (late of Cheltenham), and Alexander Beresford Hope, Esq., late M.P. for Maidstone. These two gentlemen, a northern cleric and a southern layman, have not feared to come forward in this very year to do battle on behalf of the Act of 1662, and *the Prayer-book as it is*. We are not about to take up the glove and accept their challenge, though it were no difficult matter to grapple with and fling such feeble combatants. We have had our say; and now they are welcome to theirs—*valeat quantum!* But if there be any wisdom in the proverb, *exceptio probat regulam*, we think we may confidently anticipate the verdict of the public upon any possible reply to our arguments at the mouth of the above-named pair of advocates for stagnation in the Church.

Then look at the enormous mass of publications that have issued from the press in the course of the last five years, advocating revision in every variety of form. In 1858 they might be counted by tens. In 1863 their number is legion*—the first month of this present year having added seven to the already overflowing list, among them one of a stamp not inferior to anything that has yet appeared on the subject.†

Look next at the debates in Parliament. It is true Lord

* See “Report of the Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer-book,” 17, Buckingham Street, Adelphi. 1863.

† Hebert on Clerical Subscription. See Letter cxxvii., p. 310.

Ebury has not yet ventured to divide the House; and has subjected himself in consequence to the boastful taunts of the Bishop of Oxford. But can that obstructive Prelate deny that the noble lord will appear in the ensuing May,* standing on much firmer ground than he ever did before? and that if he is still far from carrying his point, it is not because the House and the public are satisfied with things as they are, but because *the way to a remedy* is not as yet sufficiently clear?

We say nothing of Convocation, because we cannot look upon that body as fairly reflecting the mind of the clergy,† still less of the laity of the Church. But even there, silence may be considered as giving a kind of negative consent in the Upper House; while the late debate in the Lower, on the Dean of Norwich's motion, betrayed an uneasy consciousness

* His Lordship did divide on May 19, 1863; when he was supported by the following fifty CONTENTS:—

Westbury, Lord (Lord Chancellor).	Russell, Earl.	Foley, Lord.
Devonshire, Duke.	St. Germans, Earl.	Gage, Lord (Viscount Gage)
St. Albans, Duke.	Shaftesbury, Earl.	Harris, Lord [Teller]
Somerset, Duke.	Sommers, Earl.	Hunsdon, Lord (Viscount Falkland).
Ailesbury, Marquis.	Sydney, Viscount.	Lyveden, Lord.
Bristol, Marquis.	Derry and Raphoe, Bishop.	Manners, Lord.
Westmeath, Marquis.	Llandaff, Bishop.	Overstone, Lord.
Westminster, Marquis.	London, Bishop.	Ponsonby, Lord (Earl Bessborough).
Airlie, Earl.	St. David's, Bishop.	Somerhill, Lord (Marquis Clanricarde).
Catheart, Earl.	Belper, Lord.	Stanley of Alderley, Lord.
Cawdor, Earl.	Blantyre, Lord.	Suffield, Lord.
Clarendon, Earl.	Boyle, Lord (Earl Cork and Orrery).	Tannton, Lord.
Cowper, Earl.	Calthorpe, Lord.	Truro, Lord.
De Grey, Earl.	Churchill, Lord.	Wenlock, Lord.
Ducie, Earl.	Clandeboyne, Lord (Lord Dufferin and Clandeboyne).	Wodehouse, Lord.
Essex, Earl.	Congleton, Lord.	
Granville, Earl.	Ebury, Lord. [Teller]	
Grey, Earl.		

The NON-CONTENTS, however, amounting to ninety, the Bill was lost. Among these last the following Bishops recorded their votes:—Canterbury, Archbishop; York, Archbishop; Bath and Wells, Cashel, Chichester, *Darham* (alas for faith in bishops!), Hereford, Lincoln, Oxford (of course), Salisbury, St. Asaph, Winchester, *Worcester* (alas!)—making thirteen in all—hostile. (*Globe Newspaper*, May 20th, 1863.)

† See Vol. I., Letters XLIII., p. 284; XLVIII., p. 312. Also APPENDIX to Vol. I., pp. 428-32.

that things were not exactly as they should be, and that many were prepared for change, if only they could see their way to the *manner* of it.*

That some crisis is at hand, is all but universally admitted. Meanwhile the Church looks anxiously for a leader who shall steer the vessel calmly and steadily through the surrounding breakers, and land her safely in the haven where she would be. That such a one may be found in the Prelate whom the Providence of God has lately called to the chief place on the Bench,† we are not without hopes. His Grace has the reputation of being unattached to any party; a primary recommendation in one who, from his position, would have to preside over the Commission to whom this delicate and difficult matter must be entrusted.

A Revision, to be successful at the present, or at any time, must not be the work of a party. Each party, of course, thinks itself right. The natural and unavoidable result, consequently, of a party revision would be to offend all whose views were not fully carried out. No true lover of his Church should wish for this. Our one aim, after securing TRUTH, should be, to embrace, not to exclude;—to smooth down asperities, not to aggravate them. The aim of a Commission that would give contentment to as many as possible, and remove as much as possible existing grounds for discontent, should be to hear all, to weigh all, to judge all, but to favour none.‡

* The great rock a-head is unquestionably the divided state of the Church itself "at the present time," each party being distrustful of the other as to the result from a Commission sitting on the subject.

† Charles Thomas Longley; who died at Addington, Oct. 27, 1868, æt. 74. He did his utmost, I have good reason to believe, but allowed himself to be overpowered by stronger wills than his own, notably that of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, afterwards of Winchester.

‡ The Ritual Commission, 1867-70, did none of these things. It was notoriously so constituted from the outset as to preclude an impartial Report.

That it is *possible* for such a Commission to be summoned by Her Most Gracious Majesty, under the advice of her present Council, we have not a shadow of doubt; and bitterly should we regret if the day should ever come when the best friends of the Church should have to reproach themselves with having dwelt too long and too fondly on that unfortunately stereotyped phrase,

“NOT AT THIS PRESENT TIME.”

Farewell! yours, &c.,

Feb. 19, 1863.

“INGOLDSBY.”

POSTSCRIPT.

In his Preface to “The Prayer-book as it might be,”* the Rev. R. Bingham apologises for undertaking so great a work single-handed, observing very justly that it will be said that such a document ought to have emanated at least from a body of clergymen, if not from a council of bishops.

The Author of these Letters is not of that opinion. He agrees so far with the laborious editor of “The Prayer-book as it might be,” as to think the work beyond the power of any individual, be his capacities for it what they may:—and this specimen, though in many respects commendable, (especially in the Calendar of Lessons), is no exception to the rule.

But he would not have his council *exclusively a clerical one*, much less one composed *wholly of bishops*. A mixed Commission of about fifteen persons, one-fifth to be laymen, one-fifth bishops, and the remaining three-fifths to be equally selected from the other branches of the clerical profession,

* Liturgiæ Recusæ Exemplar. The Prayer-book as it might be; or, Formularies old, revised, and new, suggesting a reconstructed and amplified Liturgy. By Richard Bingham, M.A., Incumbent of Queenborough, 1863.

cathedral dignitaries, university professors, and parochial clergy, is, in the Author's judgment, the constitution best calculated to give satisfaction to the public. Everything, of course, would depend on the selection of these fifteen; five of whom might form a working quorum, and ten be permitted to decide finally upon any doubtful point. A report submitted by such a body, after two years' deliberation, could hardly fail to approximate to a solution of all the difficulties of the case.

END OF VOL. II. THIRD EDITION.

The following LETTERS, to the end of the volume, have not appeared in any previous impression of this work; having been written (as shown by the date attached to each) subsequently to the publication of the third edition. They are inserted here, as bearing more or less upon subjects treated of in other parts of the series.

Letter CXXIX.; as exhibiting the Author's views on Structural Revision after the lapse of seven years from the publication of his earlier Letters on the subject; and which views, after thirteen years' additional experience in the ministry, he sees no reason materially to alter or retract.

Letter CXXX.; as further denouncing the system of Anonymous Letter-writing, far too prevalent with the class to which the Author belongs; and also as exposing to public criticism the tactics used at the so-called *Election* of Proctors to Convocation.

Letter CXXXI.; as showing that the order of Inquisitorial Bishops is not yet extinct, and requires to be kept in check by the independent Clergy, where such are to be found.

Letter CXXXII.; as questioning the expediency of retaining the Athanasian Creed as part of the public service in the Church.

Letter CXXXIII.; as enlarging and confirming the Author's previously expressed opinions on the subject of candidates for Holy Orders;—their dearth;—the reasons for it;—and suggested remedy.

Letter CXXXIV.; as containing the Author's scheme for allaying, and he would fain hope, finally extinguishing, the present unseemly squabbles in the Church.

LETTER CXXIX.

STRUCTURAL REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

“Let us Spurgeonise the Church.”

Ingoldsby Letters, Vol. II., p. 298.

SIR,—A recent number of your valuable paper* (June 7), under the heading of “Liturgical Revision,” gives a short review of the “Ingoldsby Letters,” and towards the close of the article contains the following remark:—“We do not agree with every expression Ingoldsby has used; we would not say with him, ‘Let us Spurgeonise the Church’ (‘Ingoldsby Letters,’ Vol. II. 298), but we admire his disposition and willingness to learn from every quarter.”

Now, as this expression, “Let us Spurgeonise the Church,” taken apart from the context, is, like many others under such circumstances, liable to be misunderstood, and indeed has been so by some who have read your article, you will perhaps allow me to explain myself somewhat at large, and, in doing so, to give a short view of my general ideas on the now much-canvassed question of a revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

A reference to the Letter (cxx.) in which I made use of the phrase objected to, will show that I did not mean that we were to turn the Church into a Conventicle, even of the celebrity of the Tabernacle, but that it was possible to learn something from those who are not of our communion. We might learn, for instance, greater freedom in the use of our customary formularies of devotion; we might learn the great value of congregational singing, an eminent feature in the Tabernacle; and, above all, we might learn the power of

* The Morning and Evening *Star*, of June 7th, 1865.

animated, intellectual, and popular preaching. I do not use the word in its usual acceptance of claptrap oratory : it is far from being my wish to see such preaching introduced into our churches. *Non tali auxilio*. But it is one thing to be ridiculous, and another thing to be dull and heavy. There is a medium here, and a safe one, as in most other matters. What applies to a speech in the House of Commons, applies equally to a sermon at church. If Mr. Gladstone can succeed in making a speech upon dry figures interesting to a crowded House for three hours together, what is there to prevent a clergyman making his sermon interesting as well as instructive to a full congregation for the space of half an hour or forty minutes ? Mr. Spurgeon does it Sunday after Sunday, for a whole hour at a stretch, as I have myself experienced on two occasions ; and I shall not scruple to hear him again, whenever the occasion may offer, with a view to taking from him a lesson in rhetoric, and doing my best in that respect to “Spurgeonise the Church.” This, I believe, was all my meaning when I used that expression in one of my published letters, about four years ago ; and subsequent experience has only more and more confirmed me in the opinion that our Church would take no harm, but the contrary, by borrowing a leaf out of the Nonconformist book in this important feature of her ministrations.

As for the general question of Liturgical Revision, to which your article refers, I consider it resolves itself simply into two parts, which might be treated quite independently of one another ; but either of them would be a great boon to the Establishment, if it could be conducted in the spirit of mutual forbearance and goodwill. I mean doctrinal or non-doctrinal revision. To the latter of these I purpose confining myself at present, leaving it to others who may feel more strongly than I do on the former, to advocate their views in a similar spirit.

Taking, then, the Prayer-book as it stands, I consider, in the first place, the present calendar is in many respects very defective, and capable of vast improvement. A feature in this, that is not generally noticed, is the confusing effect that is occasionally produced by the undeviating cycle in which the Second Lesson for the Morning Service is read in our churches.* Thus it will sometimes happen that a series of lessons from the New Testament, recording the birth or early history of our Lord, will be publicly read at the period when the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, and probably the sermon, are all pointing to his Passion, Resurrection, or Ascension; while through the whole period of Advent and for a week beyond Christmas, the Acts of the Apostles form the second lesson for the day. I only mention this as one specimen, among many which might be pointed out, of the anomalies produced in our Church by the unvarying routine of our calendar. Here again, therefore, I would say, "Let us Spurgeonise the Church;" let us give, that is to say, to the officiating minister the *power at least* to vary these lessons on occasion, according to his judgment and discretion.

Then follows the rubric, including that conspicuous one upon the dress of the clergy, and the decoration of our churches. Of this it may be a sufficient argument for alteration, to allege that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the rubric is wholly disregarded; and in the hundredth, when it is observed (as, for instance, not long ago at St. George's-in-the-East), it leads to a mob besetting the church, and hooting the officiating clergyman, who in vain pleads that he is only strictly carrying out the rubric which

* This objection has been greatly obviated by the New Lectionary, which comes into full operation with the present year (1879). Shall we say "*post hoc, ergo propter hoc?*" Let our detractors say what they will, they can hardly deny this credit at least to the agitation originated and kept up for many years, by the publication of the INGOLDSBY LETTERS.

he is so solemnly pledged to observe.* The Bishop of London's speech last Friday leads me to hope that we have a chance of getting rid of it. After this follow the Sentences, where it may fairly be assumed that an infinitely greater variety of apposite texts is capable of being selected from Scripture; while it is undeniable that the habit of commencing the service invariably (or nearly so) with the one or two sentences usually selected for the purpose, has a chilling and deadening effect upon the congregation, fatal to the spirit of devotion. The same remark applies eminently to the "Dearly beloved brethren," a specimen of tautology and vain repetition which it is impossible to hear daily without a painful sense of the deplorable want of taste in the individual, whoever he may have been, who supplied that latest addition to our manual for public worship.

I need not dwell upon the *length of the Morning Service*, as I believe that grievance has become far more generally admitted than it was some seven or eight years ago, when these matters were first brought under public discussion by the publication of the INGOLDSBY LETTERS. In *country churches*, liberty might well be given to alternate certain portions of the present threefold service upon several Sundays, while in *towns* the practice might be *made general* (which is becoming more and more common in many places) of dividing the service into different portions, and holding it at various hours to suit the convenience of different members of the congregation. It is not too much to assume that the frequenters of the church in the course of the Sunday would be doubled, if not quadrupled, were this plan *universally* adopted; and certainly the attendance at the Holy Communion would thereby be very materially increased—a point

* See Vol. I., Letters LXIV.—LXVI., pp. 379—399.

about which one would think there could hardly be a difference of opinion.

A writer in the *Christian Remembrancer*, for January last, tells us that the Right Rev. the Bishop of Labuan has, on his own responsibility, constructed from the Book of Common Prayer a shorter form for the use of the districts of Dyak and Sarawak ; why should not the same privilege be extended to the provinces of Canterbury and York and the sister kingdom of Ireland ? I can conceive no good reason for retaining the present stereotyped custom, *except that it is the custom*—a custom, however, of which it may well be said it is one “more honoured in the breach than the observance.”

The omission of the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed can hardly be considered as coming within the limits of structural revision ; but that their retention in our Prayer-book is most prejudicial to the Church, and answers no good purpose to any one, will in these days, I think, be hardly denied, even *judice* his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

Of the Baptismal Offices I will not speak, as they form a distinct and lengthy subject by themselves, and I have already trenched far upon the limits of a letter.

The form for Solemnization of Matrimony is so generally mutilated in practice, that it seems highly desirable it should be adapted in the Prayer-book itself to the almost universal usage of the Church.

The offices for Visitation of the Sick and Burial of the Dead come again under doctrinal Revision, and I am accordingly barred their discussion on the present occasion.

In the Churching of Women the repetition of the Lord's Prayer is out of place when this form is used (as it commonly is) in the course of the regular service of the day.

There is much in the Communion Service inappropriate to the present advanced stage of the Christian world.

The Psalms, undoubtedly, require *dividing into three portions*, in order to adjust them to those churches (now numerous) in which three services are held on the same day.

The forms for Ordination of Priests and Deacons, with the Consecration of Bishops, are made unnecessarily and painfully lengthy by being superadded to the previous Morning Service, and would be far more effective if taken as distinct services by themselves, with proper Prefaces, Psalms, and Lessons.

An authorised hymnal is greatly needed in place of the old and new version of the Psalms now usually printed at the close of the Book of Common Prayer, but rarely adopted in any Church.

I am aware, of course, that much pains, patience, judgment, and good taste would be requisite for carrying out the above suggestions; and it may well be asked, Who is sufficient for these things? But the attempt might surely be made, and a tentative volume put forth by authority for friendly and hostile criticism, before submitting the work to the Legislature for final acceptance. It would also be highly expedient, in order to conciliate opposition to such a plan, that the option should be allowed to all existing incumbents of continuing the present use, if they please, for the term of their incumbency, with the approval of their congregations. Time would thus gradually recommend the new volume to general acceptance, and violence be done to no one's feelings, especially of those who have grown old under the present system, and who are therefore naturally averse to change.

With the question of doctrine, I do not in this Letter profess to interfere; but should it be deemed expedient to introduce doctrinal changes (to which more exception is certain to be taken than to structural ones) into the new volume simultaneously with the other, the same principle of gradual

adoption* would tend materially to mitigate the objections of those who would strenuously resist such, and at least prevent a recurrence of those deplorable scenes which disgraced the passing of the Act of 1662.

I remain, yours, &c.,

June 22, 1865.

“INGOLDSBY.”

LETTER CXXX.

THE VACANT PROCTORSHIP FOR THE DIOCESE OF LINCOLN, AND
ELECTION THERETO, JULY 5, 1867.

“Hear, land o’ cakes, and brither Scots,
If there’s a hole in a’ your coats,
I rede ye tent it:
A chiel’s amang you taking notes,
And, faith, he’ll prent it.”

BURNS.

N.B.—The contest on this occasion was carried on briskly for nearly three months,—the struggle lying, in great measure, between the Protestant and Ritualistic sections of the clergy, and the Cathedral as opposed to the Parochial interests, throughout the extensive diocese of Lincoln *cum* Nottingham.

That the battle was from the first an unequal one, will be allowed by all impartial judges, on the following grounds,—in addition to others which might be mentioned:—

1. The election was limited to a few hours *on a single day*, in the Cathedral city. *Personal attendance* was required at the poll, which was *open*; and as hundreds of the clergy lived at a great distance from Lincoln, it was simply impossible for them to attend and record their votes within the assigned limits, except on the supposition that they travelled

* See this subject *fully discussed* in Letter CXXXIV.

the day before, and took up their abode in the town for the night previous, which (on such a trifling occasion) it was ridiculous to expect they would do. The consequence was, on the day of the election, the great bulk of the distant clergy put in no appearance at all, whereas those under the shade (or rather sunshine) of the Cathedral, appeared and voted to a man (as might be expected) for the Cathedral candidate.*

2. The polling was carried on in the Chapter House of the Cathedral, at a table, *immediately in front of the presiding Bishop*, supported by his Archdeacons, Chaplains, Secretary, &c., &c., who thus in a manner overlooked (if not overawed) each individual elector, as he came forward to write his name in a book prepared beforehand for the purpose. I do not hesitate to say, at this distance of time, that such supervision is utterly destructive of the very idea of independence at *any* election,† and especially so when the relation between the Bishop and his clergy is known to be such as I have shown elsewhere. (See Vol. I., Letter III., p. 17, "The loaves and fishes" in the diocese of Lincoln.)

3. Though both candidates were present at the voting,

* One of the Minor Canons of the Cathedral being solicited over-night to vote for the independent candidate, replied, "Oh, I can't do that;—I know nothing of him; and *we dine, you know, with the other man!*"—*Ab uno disce omnes.* How many, it may fairly be asked, had no better reason to give (if so good a one) for their vote?

† In order to understand the full effect of this, you have only to conceive all the tenants-at-will, great and small, on a large estate, driven up to the poll at a contested election, and having to record their votes *openly* in a large room *immediately in front of their landlord* and his steward! I have myself witnessed something of this kind in two instances, before the ballot effectually put a stop to such tyranny, and was therefore the better able to appreciate the proceedings at Lincoln in the summer of 1867. An *analysed list of the poll-book* was afterwards furnished me by one of the "independent electors," which I have still in my possession, and which completely established the position that there is *no such thing as a fair representation of the Clergy in Convocation*, and never can be under such circumstances.

they were not allowed to address the assembled electors (amounting to some 300) until *after* the votes had been taken in the manner above described; thus depriving the latter of all means of judging of the respective merits of the candidates by hearing *from their own mouths* the grounds of their candidature.

I could give other reasons why the so-called PROCTORIAL ELECTION is little else than a repetition of the CATHEDRAL NOMINATION; but the above is sufficient to show how it comes to pass that the voice of the main body of the Clergy is so miserably represented, or rather not represented at all, in the Lower House of Convocation:—and hence its utterly farcical character as arrogating to itself the title of “The Voice of the Church!” (See Vol. I., Letter XLVIII., p. 310.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LINCOLNSHIRE CHRONICLE.

SIR,—Under ordinary circumstances I should take no notice of the calumnies of an anonymous letter writer; but in the present case it is due to the 200 independent electors who have kindly tendered me their support, and to those who have not yet decided how to vote, to reply to the letters of “A LINCOLNSHIRE RECTOR” and “CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS,” which appeared in your last.

They may be one and the same person, for anything that appears to the contrary, and certainly they are in one and the same story.

It is a well-known saying that “when your own cause is bad, the next best thing you can do is to abuse your opponent.” This *my supporters* have hitherto abstained from doing; and they may reasonably infer that their’s is *not the losing cause*, by their opponents having recourse to this last resort of the vanquished.

The “LINCOLNSHIRE RECTOR” is again, as once before,

out in his *facts*. Two full services, with sermon at each, have been given to half congregations, morning and afternoon, in this small parish, for the last six years, where Dissent has in vain attempted to establish a footing.* I have been resident on the spot for twenty-two years (now thirty-two, 1878), and for the last two (now twelve) have had the additional help of a valuable and hard-working curate.

As for the "offices of honour"—to which "A LINCOLNSHIRE RECTOR" refers,—as they have never been sought for by me, so they are not desired;—while I do not deny that the "honour" of being the *fairly elected* Proctor of a large diocese like this would be esteemed a great compliment, and accepted and valued accordingly.

"CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS" finds fault with me for being "far too clever." I am flattered by the assumption; but beg to remind him, that it was but the other day that the Bishop of Oxford said, on a public occasion, that "no fault was more fatal in the present day than being *dull*." If the candidate espoused by "CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS" is recommended by this latter qualification, I must leave it to the

* When I came to the living of Ingoldsby, in 1846, there was only *single* duty (alternately morning and afternoon), but *no Sunday school*. This last I immediately organised; and superintended all the classes (six in number) *personally*, during the hours there was no service in the church.

The system worked admirably for some time. The children were well taught, and catechised; and presently numbered not less than sixty out of a population of 400, with half-a-dozen pupil teachers.

The church was completely filled when the service was held, whether morning or afternoon, and I was fully equal to the work I had to do.

After a few years, some officious and fussy *Rural Dean* thought fit to *report* me to the Bishop (Jackson); and *double duty* (as it is called) was (after some correspondence on the subject) established. The consequence has been, a half-filled church (morning and afternoon), and the Sunday school *materially deteriorated*; and—as I had *then* (and for many years afterwards) no curate to assist me—would have utterly broken down but for the invaluable aid of my wife and daughters (with one or two of the farmers' daughters), which of course are advantages not always to be commanded.

electors to decide whether of the two qualities they prefer,—and shall humbly bow to their decision.

I am also said to be “impetuous.” I confess to having been so in my youth,—*Consule Planco*. But, it has been well said by a great authority,

“*Lenit albescent animos capillus;*”—

and at fifty-eight I find myself, alas! more apt to sin from laziness than “impetuosity.” At the same time I suppose “CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS” would have objected to St. Paul as an advocate of Christianity on the same grounds, and would never have held up his hand for Mr. Gladstone or Lord Stanley as members of Parliament.

“CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS” further objects that I commence one of my Ingoldsby Letters with the fable of the “monkey and the chestnuts.” (See Vol. I., Letter XI., p. 65.) Is it quite certain that he is not himself at this moment a “cat’s-paw” in the hands of some—I will not say “monkey,” but—higher power? and has he not found out by this time what it is to burn his fingers, or at least to have them somewhat uncomfortably handled?

It appears, lastly (following the example of the *Times*), “Ingoldsby” has nicknamed Convocation “The Parsons’ Burlesque of Parliament.”—May not this title be sufficiently accounted for by the fact that so many of the Proctors are mere nominees of a *party* in the Church,* instead of being (as my supporters wish to make them) *the fairly chosen representatives of the whole constituency*?

In now taking my leave of “CLERICUS LINCOLNIENSIS,” allow me to make one further remark:—It is a pity that one who seems to be so well posted in the “Ingoldsby Letters”

* The list of the poll after the election abundantly proved this. Almost to a man the Cathedral dignitaries and dependents (nearly all of them nominees of the Bishop) voted *against* the independent candidate.

has not profited by the advice given in Letters xvii., xix., to *anonymous* letter writers;—and let me hope that he, as well as “A LINCOLNSHIRE RECTOR,” in any future observations they may have to make on this subject, will *sign their names*,* and so allow the public to judge of their fitness to dictate to the diocese who shall, or who shall not, be their Proctor, or representative in Convocation, on the present occasion.

I remain, Sir, with many apologies for the unavoidable length of this letter, Yours obediently,

JAMES HILDYARD.

Ingoldsby Rectory, May 28, 1867.

LETTER CXXXI.

INQUISITORIAL BISHOPS AND RURAL DEANS.

“Depunge ubi sistam.”—PERSIUS.

“Where is it to stop?”

“HOR. There’s no offence, my lord.

HAML. Yes, by St. Patrick, but there is, Horatio;
And much offence too.”—SHAKSP., *Hamlet*.

SIR,—It is now just fifty years since the witty Canon of St. Paul’s wrote his memorable article in the *Edinburgh*, entitled “Persecuting Bishops.” He was moved thereto by the attempt of Bishop Marsh of Peterborough to force eighty-seven questions upon every candidate whom he examined for Holy Orders, and who were accepted or rejected according as they answered these eighty-seven questions to the satisfaction of the Bishop.†

* It is but fair to state that after the publication of the above Letter in the County paper, a considerable check was put to the flux of anonymous personalities which up to that time had disgraced column after column of the local press. (1878.)

† See Vol. II., Letter cx., pp. 233-4.

One of his remarks on the occasion was as follows :—

“ Six such Bishops, multiplied by eighty-seven, and working with 522 questions, would fetch everything to the ground in less than six months. But what if it pleased Divine Providence to afflict every Prelate with the spirit of putting eighty-seven queries; and the two Archbishops with the spirit of putting twice as many; and the Bishop of Sodor and Man with the spirit of putting only forty-three queries? There would then be a grand total of two thousand three hundred and thirty-five interrogations flying about the English Church; and sorely vexed would the land be with question and answer.”

It is probable that the terror of some new Sydney Smith arising, has kept all Bishops, whether of Peterborough or Sodor and Man, from that day to this, from enacting a similar piece of tyranny over their candidates for ordination. But history, they say, repeats itself; and as long as there are Bishops, especially High Church ones, so long shall we have men fond of showing their power, and often exceeding it, after the pattern set by Herbert Peterborough in 1822.*

Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln, has lately issued a long series of questions, not, indeed, to his candidates for Orders, but to his beneficed clergy, the Rectors, Vicars, and Perpetual Curates of the large diocese ruled over by himself and his “ Right Reverend brother,” the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham.

I have not counted these questions, and am not prepared to say that they are exactly eighty-seven in number,—neither more nor less.—But I am prepared to affirm that the quantity and quality of the interrogations here put to the clergy of this diocese is such, that if every other Bishop on the bench were afflicted with a similarly inquisitorial spirit, sorely vexed would the Church in England and Wales be with question and answer.

* It was not without reason that the present Bishop of Peterborough (Magee) said on a recent occasion that the Bishops of *the present day* were accused of being afflicted by a spirit of “ morbid activity ! ” (1878.)

The disestablished Irish clergy would probably treat the document as so much waste paper ; as, indeed, I am credibly informed, three Rectors and one Vicar in the county of Lincoln,—and one Perpetual Curate in the county of Nottingham,—have been daring enough to do on the present occasion.

As, however, this curious and original State paper is not accessible to the general public, I will give you *a short selection of one dozen* of these questions—and, *NOTA BENE*, what I give is *only* a *selection* (by way of *specimen*) from the entire series.

The document *in chief* is headed with a capital A, being accompanied by five other papers, headed severally B, C, D, E, F. One of the clergy who declined to answer this newly-imposed *articulus cleri* of the Bishop, observed shrewdly, in my hearing, “ If I say A, I shall have to say B, so I think it best to take my stand at No. 1 ; ”—and he accordingly did so ;—and I have not yet heard that a Commission of Lunacy has issued to inquire into the state of his intellect, or that he has been threatened with a summons to the “ Bishop’s Court ” at Lincoln.

This said Paper A is a series of

VISITATION QUERIES.

For the Rev. the Clergy, who are requested to fill it up, and to return it to the Bishop, at their early convenience, not later than Dec. 31, 1872,—and consists of Questions and Answers after the following fashion :—

1. CHURCH SERVICES.

How many on Sunday with sermon ?
Average congregation ?
What services on other days of the week ?

2. SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

Is it celebrated in the time of Divine service ?

3. CATECHISING.

Is it public in the church ? or elsewhere ?

4. CONFIRMATION.

Average number of candidates ?

5. HOLY COMMUNION.

How many times a year is it celebrated ?

Average number of communicants ?

After Confirmation and first Communion are there any communicant classes ?

Any classes of Sunday-school teachers ?

6. PAROCHIAL COLLECTIONS.

What collections for Missions, &c., have been made in the year 1872 ?

7. OFFERTORY.

How often are collections made at ?

8. PAROCHIAL COUNCILS. (Give details.)

9. CHURCH HELPERS. (Give details.)

10. LAY AGENCY. (Give details.)

11. DISTRICT VISITORS. (Give details.)

What is done in the parish for these purposes ?

12. Have you any suggestions to offer to the Bishop on any of the foregoing questions ? &c., &c., &c.

Now I am not prepared to say there may not be some advantage to be gained by a statistical report of the doings in the diocese on these several heads. My objection to the queries rests mainly upon the principle of the *thin end of the wedge*. My friend's remark, "If I say A, I must say B," hits the nail on the head precisely.

I demand by what authority does the Bishop ask all these questions, and *many more* ; and who gave him that authority ? If these dozen queries, and the rest, are answered to his satisfaction (or the reverse), who shall say that in the year 1873 we may not be asked in like manner,—

1. Do you preach in a gown* or surplice ?
2. Do you turn to the East in reciting the Creeds ?

* See note hereafter, p. 369.

3. Do you regularly read, or *sing*, the Athanasian Creed on all the thirteen occasions appointed in the rubric?

4. Do you ever mutilate the Marriage Service?

5. Or the Baptismal?

6. Or the Burial? or Commination Service?

7. Do you preach extempore, or from a written MS., or from notes?" and so forth.

Or, indeed, I do not see why "the spirit of asking questions" should not, by 1880, proceed as far as this,—

8. Are you a married man, or single?

9. Have you a family?

10. If so, how many children, and the sexes, and ages? specifying those of boys and girls respectively.

11. Have you a governess for the girls?

12. Is she English or foreign;—and if the latter, is she a member of the Church of England?"—&c., &c.

13. Have you a tutor for the boys?—If so, what are his views on Church matters?

14. Is he already in Holy orders, or designed for them?

15. Is he a member of either University?—and if so, which?

16. If not,—has he been educated in "my Chancellor's" School at Lincoln, or in one of the Theological Colleges at Cuddesdon,* Chichester, Bath and Wells, or Lichfield?

and so forth.

It would be easy to enlarge here to any extent. I do not wish, however, to turn a grave matter like this into ridicule unnecessarily;—but I maintain that it is essential to the independence of the beneficed clergy that they be not thus periodically subjected to the *prying interrogatories of any man*.

If one Bishop may ask with impunity fifty questions, another may ask a hundred. If a High Church Bishop may

* With regard to the Romanistic teaching at this "seminary of sound learning and religious education," a most important controversy has arisen of late between certain Laity in the diocese of Oxford and Bishop Mackarness. (See the *Rock* newspaper of November 29th and December 6th and 13th, 1878.) It is too much to be feared that not very dissimilar *training* for the ministry is carried on at not a few of the so-called "Diocesan Colleges."

probe his clergy to the quick,—a Broad Church Bishop may do the same: and sorely puzzled will the sexagenarian clergy be, how to answer matters never dreamt of before in their theology.

I have the greatest possible respect for the learning and attainments of Bishop Wordsworth; but I think he would have been none the worse as a ruler over his clergy had he served an apprenticeship of some twenty years in one of the 800 country livings in his large diocese, before sowing his crude ideas thus broadcast among them, and startling their dull ears with a hailstorm of queries, embracing in many cases matters wholly unsuited to their humble parishes.

The law has provided a set of questions which the beneficed clergy are *obliged* to answer at the *beginning of every year*; and they see no reason why they should be taxed *at the end of the year** with an additional episcopal infliction,

* The latest specimen of this spirit of putting questions is the following, received by the Author at the close of last year:—

“PASTORAL LETTER ON FOREIGN MISSIONS, 1877-8.

TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE DIOCESE OF LINCOLN.

Rischolme, Lincoln, 19th November, 1877.

BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY AND LAITY.

A letter was issued in July last by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishops of his Province, in which his Grace earnestly commended a proposal from the ‘Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,’ which has expressed a desire that ‘its members and friends in every Diocese should join, under the auspices of their Bishop, as a Vice-President of the Society, and with the help of their Diocesan Representatives and Organising Secretaries, in making *an united effort to increase the Contributions from each Diocese to the Society’s General Fund by one-half of its present amount.*’ It also stated in detail the reasons for this appeal.

In compliance with this desire of the Archbishop, I now address this Pastoral to you. But in so doing I request it may be understood that I am not pleading for one Missionary Society *solely*, but for the *Missionary cause generally*.

Having taken counsel with some who are actively engaged in promoting

which the law has hitherto seen no reason to impose, and it is to be hoped and believed, for wise reasons, never will.*

Trusting to your well-known independence in Church matters for the insertion of these few thoughts upon "Inquisitorial Bishops,"

I remain, yours faithfully,

PRESBYTER LINCOLNIENSIS.†

Jan. 9, 1873.

that cause, I beg leave to append to this pastoral *certain enquiries*, and *I request answers to them from every Parish of the Diocese*. May I ask you to reply to them on behalf of your own Parish, and to forward the reply to the Precentor, who has kindly undertaken to receive the answers, and to *analyse and tabulate them*.

QUESTION 1. How can the Laity, poor as well as rich, have their interest in Foreign Missions awakened more fully?

QUESTION 2. What, in your opinion, is the best parochial organisation for Missionary purposes?

QUESTION 3. What is your opinion as to the value of Sermons and Meetings, and of the deputational system generally?

QUESTION 4. Admitting that the amount raised in each Parish is generally not in proportion to the importance of the work, what suggestions would you make with a view to raising much larger funds for Missionary purposes?

I am, my dear Friends,

Your faithful Brother,

(C. LINCOLN.)

* A similar paper of *four quarto pages* (though not quite so inquisitorial) was issued to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, Dec. 9, 1878.

† It will be observed, no doubt, by my detractors—for they are not slow to hit a blot if they can find one (witness "A Lincolnshire Rector" and "Clericus Lincolnensis" in my last)—that the above letter was published *anonymously*. I admit it:—the reason being obvious, that it was a delicate matter for one, out of about 800 Clergy in the diocese, to be thus publicly gibbeted by *name* as resisting the assumed authority of his Bishop. I wrote my letter *on public grounds*, in a well-known London Journal, and am prepared to justify my course before any tribunal other than "the Bishop's Court." There is nothing in the Letter personally offensive, nothing but what was strictly true, and the manner in which I speak of his lordship sufficiently shows that the *animus* was intended to be (as it was) not otherwise than friendly.

INQUISITORIAL RURAL DEANS ON RITUAL REVISION.

It may be observed here that "Inquisitorial Bishops" are not the only infliction to which "the Inferior Clergy, the Priests and Deacons" of the Church, are occasionally subjected.

The following answers were returned by the Author to the Rural Dean at a Ruri-decanal chapter held on Dec. 11th, 1873, in his deanery, when certain questions on Rubrical Revision were proposed to him; and are worthy of the serious consideration of all sound Protestants throughout the land, that they may take their ground firmly at this crisis in the Church's history:—

Question I.—Position of the celebrant in saying the Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion. The question has three divisions:—

1st. Is it your opinion that the position at the north end of the Communion Table should be enjoined as the only lawful position?

Answer (by the Author): Yes.

2nd. Is it your opinion that the eastward position should be allowed to those who desire it?

Answer: No.

3rd. Is it your opinion that the westward position should be allowed?

Answer: No.

Question II.—Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof. Under this question we have six heads:—

1st. Is it your opinion that the surplice (with hood and stole) should be enjoined as the only lawful vestment for the celebrant, except in Cathedrals?

Answer: Yes; and in Cathedrals as well.

2nd. Is it your opinion that a cope being required by post-

Reformation Canons, and by the Purchas Judgment of 1871, to be worn by the celebrant in Cathedrals on certain occasions, a "distinctive vestment" should be "allowed" to the celebrant in parish churches at the Holy Communion?

Answer: Decidedly not.

3rd. If so, what should that vestment be?

Answer: No change.

4th. Is it your opinion that the surplice alone should be declared to be a sufficient vestment for all who desire no other?

Answer: Yes; except in the pulpit.

5th. Is it your opinion that a distinctive vestment (the black gown*) should be allowed in preaching?

Answer: Yes, most certainly.

6th. On the supposition that the "eastward position," and a "distinctive vestment" for the celebrant at the Holy Communion were allowed (but not required of any), is it your opinion that a declaration should be adopted by *Convocation* to the effect, that this allowance does not imply any

* On this subject the following letters are worthy of being preserved:—

THE SURPLICE OR THE GOWN IN THE PULPIT.

To the Editor of the "Rock."

"SIR,—There seems to be a constant warfare by the Romanising party against the black gown in the pulpit, and they continually assert that the surplice has been in use by ministers of our Protestant Church, when engaged in preaching, since the period of the Reformation. If any of your many subscribers are gulled by this mis-statement, let me call their attention to the twelfth charge in the "Articles of Impeachment against Matthew Wren, Doctor in Divinitie, late Bishop of Norwich, and now Bishop of Ely" (as given in a book entitled *Diurnall Occurrences*), drawn up by the House of Commons, in July, 1641.

"He (*i.e.*, Matthew Wren) the more to alienate the people's heart from hearing of sermons, in the said year 1636, commanded and enjoined all ministers to preach constantly in their *hood and surplice*, a thing not used before in that diocese, and much offensive to the people as a scandalous innovation.' I think, Sir, that we might trace to Archbishop Laud, and his

sanction, either direct or indirect, of any doctrine at variance with the formularies of the Church of England, as settled at the Reformation, and as contained in the Book of Common

school of theological opinions, the design of forcing the use of the surplice in the pulpits of the Protestant Church in this country.—Yours faithfully,

“Aldbrough Manor, Yorkshire, 1870. ANDREW S. LAWSON.”

THE USE OF THE BLACK GOWN IN PREACHING.

The Bishop of Worcester (Philpott) has also addressed the following letter to one of the clergy of his diocese :—

“Hartlebury, Kidderminster, March 13, 1871.

“My dear Sir,—It is clear to me that the recent judgment of the Court of Privy Council has not in any way affected the question of the use of the academical gown in preaching.

“The Rubric, prefixed to our Book of Common Prayer, directs that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.

“The Court of Privy Council decided in 1857 (*Liddell v. Westerton*) that the authority of Parliament here mentioned is that which established the first Prayer-book of King Edward the Sixth, and that the ornaments to be used now are those which were prescribed by that book.

“In their recent judgment (*Hibbert v. Purchas*) the Court have expressed their opinion that the Act of Uniformity which established the Rubric is to be construed with the canons of 1603, on the subject of the dress of ministers; and they have decided accordingly that Mr. Purchas offended against the laws ecclesiastical in wearing the chasuble, alb, and tunic (prescribed by the Prayer-book of 1549 for the service of the Holy Communion), the canons having directed that the minister should wear a surplice.

“Now the canon, No. 58, which regulates the dress of ministers in parish churches, directs that ‘every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish.’

“In the Rubrics of the Prayer-book of 1549, particular vestures are appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, viz., ‘a white albe, plain, with a vestment or cope’ for the principal minister, and ‘albes with tunics’ for the priests or deacons who help him in the service. It is also directed that in the saying or singing of matins and evensong, baptising and burying, the minister in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same

Prayer; and that all doctrines repugnant to those formularies are disclaimed and rejected by those by whom such allowances are made?

Answer: I have no confidence whatever in *Convocation*, as in any true sense representing the opinions of the Clergy or the Church at large; and decline, therefore, to recognise that body as having any authority in matters of faith or practice.

Question III.—On the supposition that such allowances (as above specified) were made, should they depend on the sanction of the Ordinary, having had regard to the circumstances and desires of the respective parochial congregations?

shall use a surplice. The significant direction is added, ‘It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, should use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees.’

“In neither of the two authorities to which we are referred for the dress of ministers is any direction to be found for the dress of the preacher, other than that he should wear the hood of his degree, if a graduate.

“In the absence of any positive directions we seem obliged to gather such information on the subject as we can from historical notices. I apprehend that ‘contemporaneous and continuous usage’ (to which the Court of Privy Council justly attributes great efficacy in law) may be alleged as amply sufficient, at least to justify the use of the academical gown in preaching.

“I may mention one such notice, by way of example, which is to be found in Strype’s *Annals of the Reformation*, c. 29. He mentions a petition presented to Convocation, in 1562, by thirty-two members of the Lower House (the Prolocutor, Dr. Nowel, Dean of St. Paul’s, four other cathedral deans, the Provost of Eton, twelve archdeacons, and fourteen proctors for the clergy), in which they prayed, among other things, that the use of copes and surplices may be taken away, so that all ministers, in their ministry, use a grave, comely, and side garment, *as commonly they do in preaching*.

“A careful review of the information which I have been able to gather upon the subject leads me to think that, from the time of the Reformation downwards, our Church has deliberately left the question of the dress of the preacher open, with a wise regard to unavoidable differences of opinion, and to the feelings which would be excited, without sufficient cause, by any precise and definite legislation on the subject.

“I do not think it right to recommend any uniformity of practice in this respect for the diocese of Worcester.

“Yours very faithfully,

“H. WORCESTER.”

Answer. I think not ; as it might produce (and probably would) the confusion of divers decisions in different, and perhaps contiguous, dioceses.

Ingoldsby Rectory, Dec. 22, 1874.

POSTSCRIPT.

An attempt having been made about this time to force the surplice in the pulpit on the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, the Author asked the opinion of his friend Dr. A. J. Stephens, the eminent Ecclesiastical lawyer, on the subject, and received the following reply :—

MY DEAR HILDYARD,

So far from its having been decided that the surplice is the only legal dress for the clergy while preaching, the question has *never been before the Courts at all*.

You are at liberty to make what use you please of this letter.

Yours very truly,

61, Chancery Lane, 1874.

A. J. STEPHENS, Q.C.

This letter was accordingly sent at the time to the *Record*, and we have heard no more of the *compulsory* use of the surplice in the pulpit in this diocese ; though, unfortunately, several of the clergy were deluded into adopting it, under the notion that it was wrong to resist the expressed wish of their Bishop on a matter of indifference !

It should be borne in mind, however, that our allegiance towards our Diocesan is wisely confined by the Legislature to “all things *lawful* ;” which it is clear the above requirement (like many similar ones) is not.

The pressing of the surplice in the pulpit is notoriously *one* of the steps in “the pathway to Rome” which has led to the secession of not less than 1,400 members of our Church within the last quarter of a century.—See *Whitchall Review* for Nov., 1878.

LETTER CXXXII.

DEAN M'NEILE AND THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

"A chain is proverbially no stronger than its weakest link."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "RECORD."

SIR,—I have hitherto abstained from taking any part in the controversy concerning the use of the Athanasian Creed in our public service, and should probably have preserved silence to the end, not being called upon to give an opinion on the matter.* I am moved, however, to speak out now by reading the Dean of Ripon's letter as published in your columns of the 31st ult.

It is impossible for any one who has marked the career of the learned Dean (McNeile), as I have done, for the last forty years at least, not to listen with deference to the arguments he may put forth on any public question; and I am quite ready to admit that on the present occasion he is not wanting to himself, and in nowise falls short of his customary skill and controversial ability.

Nevertheless he has not succeeded in convincing me of the expediency of retaining the Athanasian Creed as part of our public worship, now that the question of removing it there-

* The Author was afterwards asked by the Dean of Chester (Howson) to sign a petition on the subject, and he gave it as his opinion that the Creed, as a bone of contention from time almost immemorial, had better be removed altogether from the public service:—the Apostles' and Nicene Creed, the Gloria Patri, the sentences at the commencement of the Litany, "The Peace of God," "The Grace of our Lord," with the form used in baptism, &c., being in his judgment an amply sufficient recognition on the part of the Church of the great doctrine of the Trinity.

from has been raised, and obtained such extensive currency as it has done.*

* MEMORIALS ON THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

The Archbishop of Canterbury received on Monday the Deans of Canterbury and Chester at Lambeth Palace, when, on behalf of the clergy of the Northern and Southern Provinces, they presented to his Grace memorials to himself and to the Archbishop of York praying for some change either in the compulsory rubric or in the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. Their prayer was concurred in by nearly three thousand clergymen, among whom were 14 Deans—those of Canterbury, Winchester, Durham, Westminster, Bristol, Chester, Christ Church, Carlisle, Ely, Exeter, Gloucester, Lichfield, St. David's, and Salisbury; 25 Archdeacons—the Ven. Archdeacons Boutflower, Browne, Clarke, Cust, Fearon, Garbett, Hone, Hony, Hornby, J. Jones, W. B. Jones, Long, H. Moore, J. C. Moore, Prest, Sandford, Wickham, Clive, Dealtry, Gilson, Hunter, Huxtable, Ormerod, Paul, and Wise; 190 cathedral dignitaries; seven Cambridge Professors—Messrs. Swainson, Westcott, Lightfoot, Birks, Kennedy, Jarrett, and Mayor; 81 Masters and Fellows of Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge; five Principals of Theological Colleges; 13 Professors, at King's College, Durham, Sandhurst, Woolwich, Lampeter, &c.; 70 Head-Masters of Public Schools, including Eton, Harrow, Westminster, Winchester, Marlborough, Charterhouse, Cheltenham, Liverpool College and Institute, Christ's Hospital, Dulwich College, City of London, King's College School, &c.; 63 assistant masters, 16 of Her Majesty's inspectors of schools, 180 clergy of the Metropolis, two clerical peers (the Earl of Buckinghamshire and Lord Dynevor), 17 peers' sons, 11 baronets, 12 chaplains to the Queen, &c. 2,159 of those who sign have done so without any reserve, thus signifying their desire to leave entirely to the discretion of the authorities to determine whether the rubric, or the clauses, or both, shall be altered; 421 desire especially the alteration of the rubric only—218 for optional use of the Athanasian Creed, and 203 for its entire disuse in public worship; 292 desire only to touch the damnatory clauses—208 for their removal, and 84 for their alteration. The memorials were as under:—

“The humble petition of the undersigned clergy sheweth that the compulsory use, in its present form, of the confession of our Christian faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, is a cause of serious disquietude to many conscientious Churchmen, who are firm believers in the great and precious doctrines of the Trinity in Unity and of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. They therefore pray your Lordships to recommend such a change, either in the rubric or the damnatory clauses, as shall secure that the Creed in its present form shall no longer remain a necessary part of the public worship of the Church of England.”

The Dean of Canterbury (Payne Smith), in supporting the prayer of the

A chain is proverbially no stronger than its weakest link ; a castle is only so far impregnable as its outer bulwarks will resist the foe ; and I, for one, should be sorry that, in these days of attack on our Established Church, we had no better defence to rely on than this Creed, which has been the subject of controversy, even among ourselves, from the days, at least, of Tillotson to our own, that is to say, for full 200 years.* Why so ? Clearly because we see in it our weak point, and are anxious to mask it accordingly. And this the enemy are fully alive to.

I agree entirely with the Dean that the gist of the argument rests not upon the antiquity or the authorship of the Creed, nor even (in my judgment) upon the main

memorial from the Southern Province, stated that the clergymen whose names were appended to it had no ulterior object in signing it. They wished to uphold the doctrines set forth in the Creed, but they felt that many minds were prejudiced against those doctrines by their being combined with clauses which seemed to violate Christian charity. While the memorial suggested two methods in which relief could be given, either of which would satisfy the majority, their scruples would not be removed by any explanation which could be given in a note, nor by the recitation of the Creed being confined to Trinity Sunday.

The Dean of Chester (Howson) referred to two misapprehensions which were prevalent. By some it seemed to be thought that these memorials were the result of an agitation. So far as he knew, the exact contrary was the case ; no pressure had been exerted to obtain signatures, which by such a method might have been largely increased. Another misapprehension was that these memorials were the expression of party feeling ; this was evidently not the case, for they were signed by clergymen of various shades of thought. The predominant feeling in his own mind was this—that whereas in all other parts of our ordinary Church Service the stream of devotion flowed easily, this Creed was like a reef thrown across the stream, causing much disturbance of mind. As regarded the feeling of the laity, he referred to a recent strong expression of opinion on the part of magistrates, men of business, and professional men in Chester,* conveying an impression that the opinion among educated lay Churchmen in that city was nearly unanimous against the compulsory recitation of this Creed.

* See Letters LXXXIX., pp. 115-16 ; cvl., pp. 208-9, &c.

* See Letter LXXV., p. 30.

substance of the document itself. Wherever I have heard it assailed, it has invariably been upon the damnatory clauses ; and I am sorry to say I think the Dean's elaborate defence or interpretation of these is (like the clauses themselves to the Creed) the weakest point of his letter ; and he evidently feels it to be so himself, as he allows, in conclusion, that he would be glad if a solution could be found of that difficulty, the Creed itself being retained as a whole.

That these clauses keep many able men from joining our Church, as a profession, is well known,* and I can bring my

* The following letter on the subject of this Creed appeared in the *Daily News* of Nov. 18th, 1871 ; and is worth preserving, as an indication of the earnestness with which this matter has been pressed by *the Laity* upon the ears of those in authority, but alas ! hitherto without any other result than disgust at the way in which their prayer has been ignored :—

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

To the Editor of the Daily News.

SIR,—It will be in the memory of your readers that the questions relating to the Athanasian Creed were, some months ago, remitted by Convocation to the whole Episcopate. Since then no sign has been given ; and we know not whether any success (as we should deem it) has been achieved—in other words, whether any relief is to be given to the consciences of the clergy and laity of the Establishment, or to those (and they are many) who are unwillingly kept without its pale by the enforced use of the so-called Athanasian Creed. Our ignorance of ecclesiastical law and custom prevents our knowing how far the Bench of Bishops may or can report to the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, and whether they can make known publicly their recommendations on the subject. As persons long deeply interested in the result, we venture to urge upon the Church of England and the public generally the importance of speedy action. Time is passing, and, in common with many more, we feel the chilling effects of delay in checking the freedom of earnest thought and manly candour, too much fettered by the dead weight of this Creed, and in narrowing the boundaries and influence of the Church on theological topics of great moment, and also in shortening the days in which many earnest advocates of Christian truth can hope to use their powers in the service of a Church to which it has been their long-cherished wish to devote themselves. We need only remind you of the case of the late well-known Prebendary Wodehouse, whose whole life was embittered

own experience to bear strongly upon that point. Some five or six years ago I was invited to a public dinner in London,

by similar delay, while all the obstacles and difficulties that beset his path and hampered his freedom and energy (with the one exception of the Creed) were removed within a few years or months of his death. For our own parts we say, by all means let any new translation of the Creed be made that shall be at once less stringent, and yet correct. To this no objection can possibly be raised. But will this suffice? We believe many will desire with ourselves, that the plan proposed by the Rev. George Venables, at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, should be adopted, viz., of annulling the rubric enforcing its use, and letting it rest with the Articles.

The present "use" of the Creed is the main point in which the English Church differs from all other Churches of Christendom, and forms the chief barrier (so far as her services are concerned) to any harmony with either Eastern or Western Churches. Surely the ingenious author of the Creed, whoever he might be, both at the beginning and end of his dogmatic composition, forgot the solemn exhortations, "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged;" "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned." For our parts, when we reflect on the well-known fact that earnest preachers of the Gospel, who love the Church of this country better than any other, are compelled to retain the sectarian attitude of the Dissenter, because they dare not doom their fellow-men "to perish everlastingly" if they cannot subscribe to this dogmatic and mystical Creed; and that lay members of the Church, who have long been yearning for the time when they may find themselves freely and honourably enrolled among her clergy, remain unwillingly silent hearers of a Gospel which they would fain preach and spread abroad with all the energy left to them, but who for conscience' sake will not enter into holy orders on account of this obstacle to faithful candour and generous regard for the convictions of their fellow-men; we cannot but feel that some much stronger arguments than any that we have seen or heard ought to be found for retaining in the Anglican Church so unwelcome a fetter on full and free religious life and thought. It should never be forgotten that this Creed has crept into the Church service without authority; has never been recognised by a single general Church Council, and nearly the whole Royal Commission has declared that it ought in some way to be removed from the objectionable position which it now holds in the regular services and worship of our National Church. We venture to make together publicly this one more appeal, knowing that we have the sympathy of many of their lordships on the Episcopal Bench, while we are well assured of the good wishes of thousands among the clergy and laity within and without the pale of the Church.

We are Sir, respectfully yours,

JOSH. H. HUTTON, B.A., Brighton.

JOSH. CROMPTON, M.A., Norwich.

P.S.—The announcement that the Revision Committee of the Irish

given expressly for the purpose of bringing together men of mark, holding strong though diverse opinions on Church matters. I will not state who were present on that occasion, or who were not ; suffice it to say that I had the honour of a seat between Mr. Miall (the arch agitator of the Liberationists), and a celebrated Nonconformist preacher, who has since joined the Church of England, and who would corroborate, I have no doubt, what I now record.*

In the course of conversation I said to him, "Would you tell me what is the chief reason for your not joining the

Church has recommended the excision of the damnatory clauses strengthens our appeal, and, we cannot but believe, almost enforces a speedy and favourable reply.

The above letter led to the following notice in another of the London newspapers of the day:—

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

It is confessedly difficult amid the heat and rancour of controversy to arrive at just conclusions ; and this is especially the case when the *odium theologicum* is called into play. The matter in dispute just now is the claim of the Creed of St. Athanasius, as it is called, to recital in the public service of the Church as an orthodox and a judiciously framed avowal of the Catholic Faith. Those in favour of the Creed seem unwilling to part with a single fragment of this time-stained formulary, and are prepared to maintain it intact at all cost and at all hazards;—while in the esteem of others the uncompromising tone of anathema embodied in its damnatory clauses renders some change desirable.*

The letters of the Dean of Ripon, Canon Liddon, and others, have served to excite public opinion and to awaken curiosity as to what will be done in Convocation and in Parliament ; but if we may judge from a communication which, under the well-known signature of "INGOLDSBY," appeared in the *Record* of Monday last, some modification is urgently needed, if the door of entrance to the ministry of the Church is not to be hopelessly barred against the many eminent Nonconformists who, but for the stern phraseology of the Athanasian Creed, would present themselves for episcopal ordination.

* This was the Rev. Henry Christopherson, of St. John's Wood, a celebrated Independent preacher of the day (1873), who shortly afterwards joined the Church of England ; but is now dead. (1878.)

Church of England?"—"There are *several* reasons," said he; "but if you ask me for the *chief* one, I say, without hesitation, the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, which I could never consent to read aloud."—"Well," said I, "I am not surprised at that; but what if I tell you that I (an ordained minister of the Church of England) have not read that Creed in my church for the last fifteen years, and why should not you do likewise?"—"You don't say so!" was his brief reply; and there the subject dropped.

That gentleman subsequently (and, indeed, very shortly after) joined the Church of England as an ordained minister, and has, I have little doubt, brought to its service the same eloquence and ability as a preacher that enabled him to fill to overflowing an Independent chapel for many years. I will only add,—*verbum sapienti*,—if this argument does not convince the Dean, or any one else, I have no stronger to adduce;

And remain, yours obediently,

Feb. 10, 1873.

"INGOLDSBY."

LETTER CXXXIII.

THE SUPPLY OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

"None but little men now enter into holy orders."—*Charge of the Bishop of Oxford*, Nov., 1860.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHURCH PORTRAIT JOURNAL."

SIR,—The subject you request me to write upon is an extremely important one, and requiring to be handled with great delicacy;—and did I not feel that the experience of forty-five years in the Ministry gave me a kind of title to speak on it with some degree of authority, I should have shrunk from the task. It is also a lengthy question, and cannot possibly be treated (in all its fulness) within the limited space allowed by your journal.

I shall confine myself, therefore, to the three following heads, being perhaps the most material, as bearing on the question before us :—

1st. As to the notorious fact of the present deficiency and inferior quality of candidates for Holy Orders.

2nd. As to the more prominent or probable causes for that deficiency.

3rd. As to the most simple and feasible remedy for meeting, or lessening, the evil in question.

I. Under the first head, I cannot do better than give the result of my own experience and knowledge, which I have no doubt will be corroborated by the testimony of the greater part of your readers. When, twelve years ago, I was looking out for my first curate, I put my name down on the list of only two London Registries, and in less than a week I had not fewer than *nineteen applicants* for my curacy, though only able to offer £100 a year, or £80 with a title. Of course, out of such a number, I was able to make a careful selection, and the consequence was that the gentleman, already in Priest's Orders, upon whom I ultimately decided, remained with me seven years, and, though certainly feeble, yet, on the whole, gave considerable satisfaction.

Since that time, during five years, I have had to change my curate repeatedly, and on each occasion have met with still increasing difficulty in finding a successor; and, at the present time, though down on the lists of five London agents, besides advertising in four London newspapers, including the *Guardian*, *Record*, and *Ecclesiastical Gazette* (which is said to circulate amongst 23,000 clergy), I have had but *one reply*, though offering £110, or £100 with title; the work required being extremely light, as my population is only 400, and I am in constant residence myself, taking (when in health) my full share of the duty. I might enlarge upon this head, from the reported experiences of my neighbours and acquaint-

ance,* but believing the *fact* to be universally admitted, I will pass on to the second head, namely:

II. The more prominent or probable causes for this deficiency.

I should, unhesitatingly, put first in rank the "heavy blow and great discouragement" the Church has received from its late disestablishment in Ireland, and the consequent and increasing agitation of the question nearer home. This, of itself, deters multitudes from entering a profession liable to even so remote a contingency as that contemplated by the Liberation Society. The same cause operates notoriously in depreciating the value of all ecclesiastical property.

Secondly, I put the large draft that is made upon our young men for more lucrative employment under the Competitive Examination system, with the certainty of an increased

* In a late No. of the *Guardian* we find (page 1,521), 77 incumbents advertising for curates, and 36 disengaged clerics advertising for curacies, &c. In the former case, 30—that is, about two-fifths of the whole number of advertisers—say nothing as to the views of the men they desire; 11 will be satisfied with "moderate" or at least "*no extreme views*;" 6, if they can get "musical" assistance, do not seem to care much for aught beside; 6 others require "good" or "sound Churchmen," and 3 insist upon "Eastward Position;" 13 require "Evangelical" curates, the word "thorough" or "decided" being sometimes added to the specification. These, with two or three whom we scarcely know how to classify (*e.g.*, "sound Church Evangelical"), make up the account! And turning now to those who seek employment we find—four out of 36 describing themselves as "Evangelical" (one of these, however, is only "moderately" so); two are "Prayer-book Churchmen;" two stipulate for the Eastward Position, or daily services; two are "high" (one "decidedly" so); four are "musical" or "can intone;" and a fifth, though not musical himself, is fortunate in having a "musical family;" 8 hold "moderate views," and 13—for anything that appears to the contrary—have no views at all! From the small number of Evangelicals "out of place"—if we may be allowed the expression—we infer that clergy of that persuasion are most in request. And we are brought to the same conclusion by the curious fact, that of the 22 (out of 77) incumbents who have the courage to speak out and say what they want, *thirteen* desire Evangelical curates! The real difficulty is now to find the article required, for your *genuine* Evangelical curate is becoming scarcer and scarcer every day.—*The Rock*.

stipend as time advances, and, in many instances, the prospect of a retiring pension at the last; all of which, it is well known, is almost out of the hope, certainly out of the calculation, of very many candidates for Holy Orders.

Thirdly, I must put the nature and difficulty of the examination to which the candidates are subjected, by the bishops and their chaplains, contrasted with what it was some twenty or thirty years ago. I am far from saying that the examination was then all that it should have been; but I am very sure that (respect being had to the present dearth of candidates of *any* kind), it is unwise to draw the line of exclusion so hard and fast as to deter timid, and only partially informed, students from facing the ordeal, the stigma resting upon them being terrible if they are known to have gone in and failed.*

This, therefore (not to be too prolix,) brings me to my third position, namely :—

III. The best mode of meeting or lessening this admitted evil. And here, again, I must subdivide, for simplicity's sake, and say, I would *imprimis* be satisfied with a *really sound and full knowledge of the Old and New Testaments*, a *good delivery*, the power to compose fairly in *English*, and a satisfactory answer to *simple questions* on the Liturgy and Articles of our Church.

Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, a knowledge of Patristic Divinity, General Councils, Early Heresies, &c., &c., may be all very well in their way, and should, doubtless, be *encouraged where there is an aptitude for them*; but they are not essential towards making a good working curate, a country vicar or rector, and, I think I might say without offence (for I mean none), even a tolerable Bishop in our Church.

* I have had two cases of this within my own experience, and therefore speak not without some knowledge of the effects of such rejection.

Secondly, under this head, I would observe, the age of *twenty-three* is, in these times, far too late in life for the *first entry* on the ministry. Many a student goes up to College now, at the age of eighteen, with a greater knowledge of divinity and a greater fitness even for Holy Orders than men of twenty-three possessed when the present limiting Canon was made. I would certainly, and immediately, therefore, relax this stringent rule, and accept the age of twenty as sufficient for the *diaconate*, and twenty-two for the *priesthood*,—if the candidate were found, upon enquiry, in other respects fairly qualified for the office. *Graduates* of the two old Universities might also be accepted *at once* on producing a satisfactory *testamur* from the Theological Professors or examiners as to their attainments and character, with the addition of a slight *vivâ voce* examination by *the Bishop himself* (not his Chaplain).

Thirdly, and lastly, as an encouragement to young men to look forward to possible, if not probable, preferment, I would make it a condition that no one (except in the case of Fellows of Colleges) should be instituted to a living, who had not previously served a *five years' apprenticeship* (at least) *as a curate*; this would improve the class of beneficed clergy, and open the way, let us hope, for promoting some of the more deserving Curates in their turn.

Many other thoughts suggest themselves, especially that of a REVISION OF THE LITURGY, upon which subject I have enlarged elsewhere,* and which I consider second to none in this matter. But I have said enough for the present; and I have only, therefore, in conclusion, to commend the above suggestions to the kind consideration of our rulers both in Church and State. It is undoubtedly high time that *something* were done;—the case is one of great urgency, as

* See Letter ci., pp. 177-8.

striking at the very root of our Church's well-being, if not its absolute existence.

I remain, yours, &c.,

JAMES HILDYARD.

Ingoldsby Rectory, March 25, 1877.

POSTSCRIPT TO LETTER CXXXIII.

ON THE DECREASE OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

At a meeting of 300 clergymen at Islington, January, 1863, the Rev. J. R. Marsden, in speaking on the subject, whether it is a fact that the supply of candidates for the ministry from our universities is decreasing? and if so, to what is the decrease to be attributed?—made the following remarks:—

In order to obtain the necessary figures, he had applied to friends occupying positions of influence in the Church, archdeacons, examining chaplains, &c., upon whom he could implicitly rely. As to the diminution of candidates for the ministry, he was afraid there could be no question.* . . . In the last charge of the Bishop of Winchester it was stated that the total number of candidates for the Christian ministry ordained throughout the whole of England in 1841 was 606, and that the total number ordained in 1861 was only 570. This showed an actual diminution of nearly 40, and the falling off would have been much greater but for the increase in the number of those who were called literates—that is, persons who were ordained without having obtained degrees. In 1841 the number of gentlemen from Durham was 13, from Dublin 33; while the number of literates—that is, persons who

* Archdeacon Denison, in *Notes of his Life*, chap. ii., p. 15 (*apropos* of the decay of Greek and Latin), makes the following observation:—"The race of life in a country where the supply of candidates for all callings, professions, and employments, largely exceeds the demand, has evolved the habit of assigning the early years of life to acquiring the knowledge wanted for particular employments, so that bread-winning may begin the sooner. . . . The only exception that I know of, is that of Holy Orders in the Church of England!" This—after an interval of fifteen years since the above was first published by the author—speaks volumes.

were educated privately—was 38. Twenty years after the number from Durham was 31, from Dublin 80; but the literates had increased to 241. This diminution was calculated to arouse serious apprehensions for the future, unless some remedy could be applied. But it did not represent the whole or the worst part of the case. During the last thirty years the population of England had nearly doubled, and there had been no corresponding increase in the number of clergymen. Within the same period 2,000 additional churches had been erected, and yet the supply of ministers, instead of being proportionately increased, exhibited an actual diminution. Taken altogether, this state of things called for serious consideration on the part of those who loved the Established Church, and especially those who desired to see an increase of spiritually-minded men engaged in the ministry.

Another question was, whether there was any falling off in the qualification of the candidates—he meant the mental qualifications. He feared that there was a falling off of mental power in the candidates for the Church. Taking the first-class men at Oxford, *in literis humanioribus*, he found that, in the ten years from 1831 to 1840, there were 130 first-class men. Of these 92 took orders, and 38 remained laymen; the difference in favour of the clergy being 54. In the ten years from 1851 to 1860 the number of first-class men was 119, as against 130 in the previous ten years. But, of the 119, only 42 took orders, and the rest continued laymen; so that, whereas before there was a difference of 54 in favour of the clergy, there was now a difference of 35 on the side of the laity. It was, therefore, not altogether without reason that the public complained that there were not so many young men of first-rate talent entering the ministry now as there were in former times. There was, it seemed, a deterioration quietly going on, which, though not much perceived at present, would tell seriously by-and-by.* Again, the numbers from Oxford, not first-class men merely, who now took orders, were comparatively few. Cambridge was the grand school from which the Church of England was supplied.

Trinity Sunday was the great ordination day of the year. On Trinity Sunday, 1861, there were in round numbers 300 candidates. Of these 153 were Cambridge men; only about 70 were Oxford men; and the remaining fourth were either literates or men who had gone through the brief education of the theological colleges and schools in various parts of the kingdom. On Trinity Sunday last 400 candidates were ordained. The proportions were about the same; 200 were Cambridge men, 100 were Oxford men, and the remainder came chiefly from the

* It may be fairly assumed that much of the infidelity now said to prevail in the kingdom is due to the want of *Power* in the pulpit to contend successfully with the growing evil. (1878.)

various provincial colleges. On the whole, the conclusion to which he thought they must come was, that fewer men of high talent and education entered the Church now than formerly.

For this state of things various causes have been assigned. One of the chief was the opening afforded by the Government examinations to an immediate and comfortable position in life. As a friend of his put the matter, it was a hard thing for a young fellow to look £100 a year in the face. Even a young man of piety might say to himself, "Is all usefulness confined to the clergy? Might I not serve God and get £500 a year too?" A second cause was the poverty of the Church generally. It was not merely curates who suffered from this. The poverty of the Church was a very general, serious, and growing evil, and arose from many causes, among which was the abolition of pluralities (illustrating the fact that there was no good without an attendant evil), the non-endowment of new Churches, and the prohibition in many cases against taking pupils. A third cause was the distressing and unsettled state of mind at the Universities. This was enough to fill one with overwhelming sorrow. Many of those who should be the guides of youth were themselves distracted with doubts as to the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel; some of them did not hold those doctrines in godly simplicity and sincerity; and the number of those who taught the only real, substantial, entire body of the truth, the truth which they called Evangelical, was, he feared, in any of the Universities very small indeed. The consequence was a great disturbance of mind in many young men, and great hesitation on their part about entering the ministry of the Church. Another cause was the apprehension of grinding labour. The labour which young men saw their elders undergo had the effect of discouraging them, and deterring them from seeking ordination.

In conclusion, he would suggest a few remedies for the evil which was proved to exist. On the question of patronage he would say nothing, because nothing that he could say was likely to produce any real change; only he should deprecate exceedingly the popular remedy—namely, that the livings should be open, as Government places were, to those who could pass the best examinations, or that curates should be promoted in a sort of rotation or cycle, according to the number of years they had served. There were remedies, however, within their reach. An archdeacon in a northern diocese thought that clerical societies should be supported, and that they should look out not merely for young men of piety, but also for young men of gentle birth, as candidates for Holy Orders. He thought that all the clergy might do more than they had done in this matter. Clerical families were the nurseries of the Church of England. If they would have their sons grow up for this work, let them magnify their office in their presence, let not their household see them pitifully whining after preferment, and cringing to

a lord or a rising man in Church and State. Lastly, there was a remedy in prayer. Prayer on this special point was commanded by our Lord himself. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers into His harvest." Let it be their earnest supplication that God would send forth more faithful young men to devote themselves to Christ's service in the ministry.

LETTER CXXXIV.

THE ONLY WAY OF OVERCOMING THE DIFFICULTY.

"Faint, yet pursuing."—Judges viii. 4.

"We have scotched the snake, not killed it;
She'll close and be herself:—whilst our poor malice
Remains in danger of her former tooth."

MACBETH, Act iii., Sc. 2.

TO MY READERS.

ONE more LETTER, and I trust to release you for ever from the tedium of wading through this "hare-brained chatter of irresponsible frivolity."*

That THE LETTERS have run to such an inordinate length is no fault of mine. I would have abridged them, or stopped them altogether, twenty years ago, had I been permitted to do so. The blame, if any, for their continuance up to this date, rests with my opponents. Our ground of controversy still exists, though broken. The grand nut of REVISION remains still to be cracked. The Gordian knot of an "unreformed Book of Common Prayer" is not yet untied; much less is it cut through.

Some fair attempts, indeed, at this last have been made; but I think it will be generally allowed that they have proved upon the whole more or less of a failure;—and such possibly would be the case with the simple *nostrum* I am now about to propose for your kind consideration.

* Lord Beaconsfield at the Mansion House, Nov. 9, 1878.

That Ritualism, or Romanism, or Puseyism (call it by what name you will), has run to an outrageous length since the Letters on the riots at St. George's-in-the-East* were originally published, cannot be denied. It is equally certain that the Bishops, the Law, and even Parliament itself, have proved all but powerless to arrest the plague-spot which has been for years spreading far and wide within the Church. The utmost they have succeeded in doing, is, to have temporarily "scotched the snake."—It writhes, and writhes, and writhes;—but there it still is, wriggling about;—certainly not "killed," or permanently "put down."†

What then should wisdom suggest as the proper course to pursue under such circumstances?—for it is surely absurd to go on any longer, as we have been doing, spending thousands of pounds yearly in fruitless litigation, benefiting no one but the gentlemen of the long robe, who chuckle inwardly over our intestine divisions, while they meanwhile reap a rich harvest for themselves, to the grief of the truest friends of the Church, and the scorn and derision of her enemies.

The fact is simply this:—you cannot "put down" conscience *vi et armis*.‡—Like the snake in our motto, "she'll close" in spite of us "and be herself again;"—and if these men believe, as it is clear they do, that they have a justifiable *locus standi* in that Book of so-called "COMMON PRAYER,"—to which they subscribed when they were ordained, and which subscription they have repeated as often as they have accepted any position or preferment in the Church,—who can blame them?—who has a *right* to blame them?—We are no more entitled to blame them, than we are to

* See Vol. I., Letters LVIII., LXIV.—LXVI., pp. 354, 379-99.

† The sole object of the Public Worship Act of 1876-7 was avowedly to "PUT DOWN RITUALISM;" which it has not yet done.

‡ "Expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret."—HOR., Ep. i., x. 24.

denounce the 2,000 Nonconformist Ministers, who, for the very same reason, (*mutatis mutandis*), refused to submit to the oppressive Act of Uniformity of 1662.

What this *locus standi* is, I need not recapitulate to any one who has read but a fraction of the preceding LETTERS.

Suffice it to say (merely as a sample), that they stand—or imagine they have a right to do so—upon the “Vestment Rubric,” the “Confession and Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick,” the “Verily and indeed,” &c., in the Church Catechism, the “Receive ye the Holy Ghost” in the Ordination Service, &c.; to say nothing of the interminable disputes as to the correct interpretation of the word “Regenerate” (and its inevitable consequences) in the Baptismal and Confirmation Services.

Are we, then, to force these men to accept *our* view of these words (which, after all, no one can deny is an unnatural and constrained one); or are we to accept *their* view, which some of us think—and I scruple not to say, I am myself of that number—rests upon a residuum of Popery, which ought to have been expunged by our Reformers at the first or second Review of the Book, but which was unhappily (perhaps unavoidably) retained, for much the same reason that it has been retained there ever since,—namely, a vain hope to reconcile conflicting opinions on such matters, by allowing something to the peculiar notions of each party in the Church?

This view of the case is so palpably transparent throughout the whole Office of administering the Holy Communion, that it may be fairly taken as a key to the *animus* which at that critical epoch actuated the Revisors (we might almost say the Compilers) of the Book of Common Prayer.

‘What then,’ you may ask, ‘is your own idea of meeting (and, if possible, surmounting) this prodigious difficulty, without more offence than is inseparable from the extremely delicate nature of the task?’

My reply is, I would have the entire Prayer-book once more submitted to a WHOLESALE REVISION by a Commission of about a dozen pious and God-fearing men,—not more.

I would give them two years—and two years only—to produce their Revised Volume for *public criticism*, and correction if need be :—their attention being especially directed to the above-named points in dispute, and others (well known) of a similar nature.

The new Book, like the new Lectionary, should, after such public sifting, be subjected to the approval of both Houses of Parliament, and the sanction of the Crown ;—and, finally, at the expiration of another twelvemonth, become the LAW OF THE LAND for all future subscription.

But here—mark—comes in my peculiar *nostrum*.

I would allow *all* those of the clergy who *have been ordained or preferred*, under the *previous* subscription, to retain the use of the OLD BOOK (if they desire it) for the term of their natural lives, without being subjected to any legal prosecution, or molestation whatever, for such interpretation as they (in their conscience) may see fit to put upon it, whether in word or deed.

But for *all* who should be *thereafter ordained or preferred*, the NEW BOOK—expurgated, we would confidently hope, from all objectionable or controverted expressions—should be the condition on which they enter the Church as a profession, or proceed from step to step in it.

The process, of course, would be a *slow* one, but it would be *sure*. At any rate, nothing conceivable can be worse than the state of things we now witness ; and at least the Church would be spared all the recriminations and mutual accusations to which it has been exposed ever since the last Review, and from which I see no other possible way of escape.*

* Bishop Thorold (of Rochester), in his late Charge, recommends

When the NEW BOOK should be fairly in operation, those who do not like its teaching would simply decline to accept it *professionally*, and would remain (as Nonconformists now do) without the pale of the Establishment. There would be no hardship in this to all new comers ;—the gigantic evil of 1662 would not be repeated, of *ejecting* men from the position they had held under different conditions, and which position they had a moral, not to say legal, right to retain.

I do not expect the above suggestion to commend itself to all my readers, or possibly to many of them. But this I am prepared to affirm against all comers, that *any* remedy would be better than the disease and moral scandal as it exists at present :—and I will therefore conclude by repeating here, what I have said elsewhere,—*

“Si quid novisti rectius istis,
Candidus imperti ;—si non, his utere mecum.”

“Farewell ; and if a better system’s thine,
Impart it freely,—OR MAKE USE OF MINE.”

I am, your faithful friend and earnest well-wisher,
Dec. 30, 1878. “INGOLDSBY.”

“isolation” as the best remedy for “putting down” what he considers the evil of Ritualism. This may be all very well with “the foot-and-mouth disease” among cattle ; but it does not follow that it would be equally successful with the malady now prevalent among the so-called “black sheep” of the Church. These men are either right or they are wrong. They have either, as they profess to have, a legitimate hold upon “that jewel the Prayer-book” to which (with their leader, Dr. Pusey) they have sworn their allegiance—or they have not. If they have *not*, the *onus probandi* clearly rests with the Bishop. If they *have*, then they are as much entitled to his favour and toleration, if they care for it (which I very much question), as any other of the clergy in his diocese. The Bishop will find, at last, that there is but one remedy for the mischief of which he complains, and that is REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK ITSELF, and a clear and distinct enunciation of *what are*, and *what are not*, the doctrines of the Established Church upon the points now, and for years past, in dispute. (Dec. 30th, 1878.)

* See Vol. I., Letter XXVI., p. 182.

POSTSCRIPT TO FOURTH EDITION OF THE “INGOLDSBY LETTERS.”

As the Author has taken nothing else by

“All his writings, all his midnight pains,
A life of labour,”—

than an infinite number of compliments, bearing no manner of fruit, he may fairly be excused putting on record here (as he did at the close of the first volume) one of these unbought, unsought testimonies from an unknown hand, which appeared in the Liberal organ of that University where he spent the best part of his life, and where he was consequently best known, before settling down in the quiet village which has supplied him with the leisure necessary for such an arduous undertaking as that on which he has had the courage to embark.

REVIEW OF THE SECOND EDITION OF THE “INGOLDSBY LETTERS.”

(“CAMBRIDGE INDEPENDENT PRESS,” 1862.)

“Probitas laudatur—et alget.”—JUVENAL, *Sat.* i., 74.

We have had the pleasure of noticing and recommending the first series of these Letters, and now welcome the continuation of them.

“Ingoldsby” is an open, true-hearted Englishman, and there beats under that black coat of his—for he is a clergyman—as brave a heart as any soldier can boast. It is not more difficult to take a Sebastopol or Gaëta than to batter down the prejudices of some men against Church reforms. We do not know many things more difficult than for an author to write a series of letters, extending over several years, on one subject, and that subject by no means an exciting or attractive one;—but this is what the Author of the “Ingoldsby Letters” has done, and done well.

"Ingoldsby" is a name well known in modern English literature, first by the "Ingoldsby Legends," and now by the "Ingoldsby Letters." We wish we could say that these letters were somewhat in the nature of legends, but indeed they tell a true and sorrowful tale—a tale often told of a blind unreasoning resistance, of persons who are in authority, to the moderate requests of those who know that the safety of a Church, like that of a State, consists in cautious progress,—in going forward, and not in sitting still.

"Ingoldsby," the author of these instructive as well as interesting letters, is, we believe, the Rev. James Hildyard, a distinguished scholar of the University of Cambridge, who remains—by some oversight, we are sure, on the part of the dispensers of Church preferment—rector of a small country parish in Lincolnshire. He has the pen of a ready writer, considerable powers of sarcasm and irony, an inexhaustible supply of allusions to, and quotations from, the best writers of ancient and modern times, a genial love of liberty, and a hearty detestation of all attempts to revive in the Church of England those arbitrary principles of Laud, which once overthrew the Church, and will overthrow it again, unless they are checked. Believing that the Prayer-book, though very good, may be made better—that the divines who lived two or three centuries ago did not monopolise all the wisdom and piety of the country, but have left a little of both to the people of the present day—believing these things, "Ingoldsby" has come to the conclusion that we may safely, and should without delay, suit the Prayer-book to the wants of our own times.

Having by a very simple process come to this conclusion, he, like a sincere and honest Englishman, being in downright earnest about the matter, applies himself to the uninviting task of showing that all the objections now made against altering a line, even a word, in the Book of Common Prayer, have been made over and over again—in fact, whenever the subject has been agitated, and that they have also been answered as often as made.

It is well known that every reform which has been made in the Church, and every reform which has been made in the State, involving ecclesiastical questions, has been obstinately resisted by the majority of the clergy, but has been carried in spite of their opposition, and has proved ultimately for the peace and welfare of the Church. This is the great lesson which "Ingoldsby" is teaching. The ministers of the Established Church should not require to be taught such a lesson. At school and at college they read history, but they seem little the wiser for it—at least, the majority of them. They should remember that the Church can no more resist reforms with safety than the State can; what is good and safe for the latter is good and safe for the former.

"Ingoldsby's" object is to advocate not so much this or that alteration, much less does he seek the triumph of High Church or Low

Church; but his aim is, as we have said, to show that all the objections urged by the bishops, and others who look to them as the sources of inspiration and—what is perhaps more important—of preferment, are worthless. Of all dangers which beset the Established Church, there is no danger so great as that of resisting reasonable reforms. This is what “Ingoldsby” sees, and what he wishes others to see. As well-wishers of the Established Church, we hope that his enlightened views will prevail gradually among Churchmen; we hope that they will read and ponder his letters, and that they will be induced, before it is too late, to adapt the Church to the wants and wishes of the people of the nineteenth century.

The “Ingoldsby Letters” abound in sarcasm of a refined and therefore telling character. Some of the bishops are, it is true, severely censured for the manner in which their sentiments on Church reforms have changed with their change of position in the Church. The Bishop of Oxford is of necessity frequently alluded to in the letters. It is impossible to deny that this bishop—through his undoubted abilities, his mystical eloquence, his tact, and those various personal advantages which strongly affect the feminine mind,—the melodious voice and polished manners,—is exercising a powerful influence over certain classes of society. We believe that it is not a healthy influence. The great body of the people are with “Ingoldsby” in this matter. A rigid ecclesiastical system, which is plainly with too many clergymen the ideal of a perfect church, is utterly unsuited to the present generation. The great value of these letters of “Ingoldsby” is the courageous protest which they make against this Sacerdotalism. We should be glad to see the same protest repeated in higher quarters. Nor can we forbear adding that it is not for the honour, it is not for the advantage of the Episcopal Church, that the Bishop to whom we have alluded should exercise such enormous influence over his brethren. It is hardly necessary for us to say that the large, tolerant, and liberal views which are entertained by Mr. Hildyard have our entire sympathy; they are the same which we have invariably advocated as the best for Church and State. “Above everything Liberty,” said the glorious John Selden; and in this noble spirit “Ingoldsby” writes, and for this we admire him.

We recommend to our readers the “Ingoldsby Letters;” they will see the weak character of the objections brought against revising the Prayer-book, and acknowledge that we have not spoken too highly of the author and his writings.

The Author would also hope to be forgiven the pardonable weakness of putting on record here the opinion entertained of his work by a well-known Editor, to whom he begs to take

this opportunity of returning his sincere thanks for this honest and unbought testimony to one whom he has never seen, and who is only known to him as an unit among the many contemporary Clergy who are honoured by a niche in his gallery of Portraits.

REVIEW OF THE "INGOLDSBY LETTERS" IN THE "CHURCH
PORTRAIT JOURNAL," MAY, 1877.

THE INGOLDSBY LETTERS, IN REPLY TO THE BISHOPS IN CONVOCATION AND IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. *By the Rev. James Hildyard, B.D., Rector of Ingoldsby, Lincolnshire.*

We have received copies of these two handsomely printed and bound volumes, the publication of which excited so much attention and controversy some fifteen years ago. The author of the appropriately named "Ingoldsby Letters" is the Rev. James Hildyard, whose photograph appeared in our last number (April, 1877). The writer deals with the question of Prayer-book Revision, which was the theme of so much disputation about fifteen years ago, in a series of one hundred and twenty-eight letters to various journals. These letters advocate a view of the subject which was not then—and is not at the present time to a much greater extent—in favour with the heads and chief authorities of the Church. It is impossible, however, notwithstanding any failure to agree with the writer's arguments and conclusions, to do otherwise than admire the skilful way in which he handles a confessedly difficult subject, and envy the literary ability which has put generally unentertaining matter into so popular and readable a shape. Mr. Hildyard is a perfect master of sharp, pointed, and appropriate quotation; the classical writers of old and the popular authors of modern times are alike pressed into his service, and their happiest conceptions and most pithy epigrams turned to account. It is interesting in the present day to turn over particulars of the controversies and struggles which obtained in the Church fifteen years ago, and many of which, unhappily, are still going forward:—some in a greater, some in a less degree. Mr. Hildyard's account of the riots at St.-George's-in-the-East, in Letters LXIV., LXV., LXVI., is painfully interesting. The thought of what the present condition of the parish is, brings a sense of relief to the unpleasant feeling raised by the picture presented of the then state of affairs. Mr. Hildyard's INGOLDSBY LETTERS are well worthy of perusal,—if not altogether for the line of thought and opinion which they adopt,—at all events for their literary ability, their pleasing diction, and the unquestionable scholarship of their author.

THE following notice also, selected out of many, of the THIRD EDITION of these Letters appeared in the *Illustrated News of the World*, No. 286, July 25, 1863:—

A collective and complete edition of these admirable letters of the Rector of Ingoldsby—the Rev. James Hildyard—is a desideratum, and one which we are glad to see has at length been supplied.

To his great theme, the REVISION OF THE LITURGY, Mr. Hildyard has devoted no inconsiderable amount of time and learning, money and thought. Like all reformers, he is at present in a minority, but he has faith in the future—the signs of which become brighter every day.

When he first undertook the subject on which he has been so long engaged, he was fully aware that he was entering upon one which would prove not only uninviting itself, but calculated to array against him an immense amount of personal hostility. For the latter event he was prepared, but his difficulty was how to make his argument popular. No one will read a dull book if he can help it, and as the subject was essentially a dull one, there was no chance of obtaining readers so long as the old beaten track was pursued. He felt that his only chance of getting readers lay in his ability to provoke or amuse.

Mr. Hildyard has succeeded in both, and his book is all the better for it. He is a fine specimen of the English clergyman. He is of no party in the Church. All he wishes is a REVISION OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, honestly and fairly set about. In his letters devoted to this subject, he deals with his opponents and their arguments with all the weapons at his command, whether of ridicule or reason, and his volumes are no mean addition to the theological and controversial literature of the age.

INDEX.

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
A king sat on the rocky brow	70
A man full of words shall not prosper	215	...
A man of but one idea	321
A man of few words	341	...
A plain blunt man	90
A practical joke	314
A sophisticated rhetorician, &c.	90
A subtle disputant on creeds	263
A thing devised by the enemy	138
A vote is a vote	308	...
A word in due season	379	...
Abbot, Archbishop, and the Puritans	266
Abbot and Land of 1860	267
Abridged <i>versus</i> corrupted services	142	...
Abridgment of services	315-18
—— of the Morning Service	32-43	...
Absolution, form of, in Ordination Service	19, 47
—— in Visitation of the Sick	156	191, 389
Abuse the plaintiff's attorney	363	...
Ac veluti magno in populo, &c.	233	...
Academical test, sound in the main...	165
Act of Uniformity, review of	196-245
—— and the bishops	410	...
—— debate of May 27, 1862	326
—— evil effects of	173, 184	250
—— proposed repeal of, 1863...	343
—— under Elizabeth	361	...
Ackworth, Rev. W., and the bishops	325
Adjournment of Convocation, 1859... ..	282	...
Administration of the Communion	188
Advance of the Ten Thousand	67, 213
After this manner do ye	256	...
Age of Progress in everything but the Church	55	...
Agitation, a poor miserable one	213	...
Agreeing to differ	363	331
Alarming state of the diocese of Oxford, 1860	260	...

			VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Allen, Archdeacon, on the Prayer-book	169
Altar, Mediæval, at Cuddesdon	389	...
Always of questionable expediency	173	...
American Church of 1785	193
——— Prayer-book, Bishop Short on	333	...
Amiability, danger of too much	205	...
Amphora cœpit institui, &c.	75
Amputation and excision	121—124
An petat urbem a Cannis, &c.	127
An understanding	18
Andrews, Bishop, his altar, 1623	389	...
Anglican Popery	397	...
Angnilla elapsa est	103	...
Anonymous letter-writing	117	361
Another mizzling, drizzling day	334	...
Apis Matinæ more modoque	185	...
Apocrypha, Bishop of Oxford on, 1855	114
——— liberty not to read	155	...
Apology for the Ingoldsby Letters, 1859	411	...
Apostles, blood of the	369	...
——— Creed, simplicity of	182
Apostolic blows and knocks	395	...
Appeal from Cæsar to Augustus	297	...
Appropriation clause	293	...
Aquæ nisi fallit angur	140	...
Aquila de Rupe	49
Aræ et foci, safe for another lease	335
Arbela, the battle of	71
Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner)	347	93
——— Longley and Athanasian Creed	209
Archdeacons, divided on Revision question	247	...
——— many types of	320	...
Archdeacon Denison on the Prayer-book, 1859	412	...
Archer, the, of Cuddesdon	333
Ardet atrox Volseus, nec teli conspicit, &c.	117	...
Arguing in a circle	349	...
Argumentum à ridiculo	120	...
——— à cultro	339
——— ad hominem vel homines	68
——— ad verecundiam	181
Argyll, saying of Duke of	93
Arithmetic, the natural cure of fear	165
Arnold, Dr., and the Liturgy	19	...
——— and the Tractarians, 1838...	27

VOL. I.	VOL. II.
PAGE	PAGE

Articles, Canons, and Liturgy, unalterable...	253
Articles of Religion, reformed	193
——— reduction of, to twenty	174
As bees on flowers alighting, &c.	...	325	97
As in a theatre the eyes of men, &c.	...	99	...
Assent and consent	...	81, 405.	178, 246
——— repeal of, 1863	343
——— what does it mean?	119
Association for Promoting Revision, 1860	195
Athanasian Creed, Archbishop Longley on	209
——— Archbishop Whately and others on	115, 116
——— Bishop Marsh and others on	...	155	...
——— Bishop Thirlwall on	...	174	...
——— date of	208
——— explanatory note to	...	426	...
——— how often read	...	220	...
——— Jeremy Taylor on	182, 199
——— Memorials, &c., on	187, 374-8
——— Norwich demonstration against, 1872	30
——— omission of	187, 379
——— Simeon's opinion on	31
——— Tillotson, Tomline, Jortin, and Watson on	116
——— to be left alone	30
Atherton Leigh Powys, and the Prayer-book	...	375	...
Attic kalends	...	181	...
Auckland, Lord, on Revision, 1861...	...	337	...
Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris, &c.	...	415	...
Augean stable	301, 393
Augustine and Pope Gregory	...	245	...
——— on change	...	152, 197, 367	...
Auriculis nasoque carentem	121
Authority of the Church	...	309	...
Axe laid to the root of the tree	41
Away with subscription	276
Backbone son of the Reformed Church	...	218	...
Balguy, Dr., and clerical preferment	...	373	...
Banns, publication of	...	393	...
Baptism, service for	317, 330
Baptismal Services	189, 389
Barbaras ædes aditure mecum, &c.	...	238	...
Baring, Bishop, Charge of, and resignation (1878)	215
——— on Act of Uniformity	...	173	...
——— on Convocation	...	313, 342	...
——— on Revision, 1860	158-171

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Bartholomew's-day, Girdlestone on	257
Bath and Wells, Charge of Bishop of, April, 1861	337	...
Bathurst, Bishop, on combative prelates	319	...
Bating your price	271
Battle of Arbela	71
——— of the books	375	...
——— of the Boyne, 1858	183	...
Be with caution bold	343	...
Being gone, I am a man again	163	...
Bel and the Dragon	65
Bellua multorum capitum	162	...
Ben Cruachan and its double peak	143
Berens, Archdeacon, a Revisionist	295	...
Bethell, Bishop, on Church in Wales	289	...
Bible, the authorised version of	330	304
Bicentenary of 1662	257
Bid the lovely scenes at distance rise	140	...
Bids him defiance stern and high, &c.	268	...
Bill, the whole, and nothing but the bill	93	...
Bingham, Rev. R., and revised Prayer-book	49, 348
Bishop Suffragan and ex-Colonial	118	...
Bishops, a word with them	425	92, 256
——— amount of personal occupation	235	324
——— and Act of Uniformity	127
——— colonial, their title	243	...
——— in reign of Queen Mary	173
——— not unanimous	274	131
——— perfectly unanimous	272, 274, 337	131
——— present at debate of May, 1860	95
——— pulling mitres	34
——— their knowledge of individual parishes	325
——— wigs, date of leaving off, 1832	93	...
Bishopries, examination for	233
Bit-by-bit legislation	107
Black Bartholomew's Day, 1662	257, 307
Black gown in preaching	369-371
Black spirits and white	377	...
Bligh, Rev. E., of Rotherfield	266
Blomfield, Bishop, on Revision, 1834	127	...
Bonney, Archdeacon, on moderate revision	150	...
Bore, definition of one	321
Boulbee, Rev. T., on canonical reform	217
Boyne-hill confession, 1858	220	...
Brevis esse laboro, &c.	12

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Bridport, Synod of, Sept., 1860	368	...
Bright, Mr., and the bishops, 1859	268	...
Brighton, St. Michael's Church at	357	...
——— St. Paul's Church at	334	...
Bristol Association, programme of, 1860	203
Broadchalke, Vicar of	204
Brothers' controversy, The	209
Bryan King, Rev., of St. George's-in-the-East	355	...
Burgess, Bishop, on Parliament	366	...
Burial after a Catholic manner	257	...
——— of the dead, service for	191-2
——— service, Rev. F. Massingberd on	412	...
——— alternative form of	427	134-5
——— bishops' opinion on	279	...
——— petition of 4,000 clergy on	279	...
Burke, on Church membership	268
——— Dissenters	278
——— Feathers' Tavern Petition	295
Bustling, bitter, theological prelate	234, 239
BUT	181, 241	104-5
Butler, Bishop, on Church dignitaries	234	...
——— late Head Master of Shrewsbury	88	...
C. W. T., his assault on Ingoldsby	124	...
Cædimur, inque vicem præbemus terga, &c.	154
Calamy, Edmund, and the assent, &c.	179
——— on comprehension	156
——— on Convocation and Parliament	158
Calendar of Lessons, revision of, needed	155, 331	113, 185
Caligula's horse	259	...
Calling a spade a spade	162
Camarina not to be stirred	289	...
Cambridge University, contested election, 1859	306	...
Can nothing be done?	246
Candidates for ordination	379-384
Candles on the altar	389	...
Candle-smuffers and scene-shifters	2
Canon XXIX., attempt to repeal	107
——— XXXVI., subscription to	221
——— ——— on sponsors at baptism	319
Canon Wodehouse of Norwich, 1860	17
Canons and Rubrics	127
——— Bishop Short's opinion on	329	...
——— Book of 1604	221
Canonical and Rubrical reform	217

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Cautab and the small toothed comb	145	...
Caput, the, at Cambridge	207	...
——— inter nubila condit	227
Careless reading of the Service	39	...
Carlisle, Dean of (Close), 1863	345
Cassandra of 1689	77	...
Castle of Indolence	276
Catechism, the Church form of	189
Cathedral service, histrionic character of	34	...
Cat's-paw	65	360
Cantion does not mean doing nothing	352	...
Cave, Dr., on date of Athanasian Creed	207
Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte	85
Cede repugnant cedendo victor abibis	115	...
Census of 1861	77	63
Chancellor's school at Lincoln, 1873	365
Chanting the Creed	391	...
Charity and meekness	171
Charles II. and subscription to the Prayer-book	261
——— V. and his clocks	262
Château qui parle, femme qui écoute	142	...
Chester, Bishop of, and the <i>Times</i> , 1859	371	...
Cheyne, Rev. Patrick, of Aberdeen, 1860	73
Chillingworth on Athanasian Creed	182
Chillon, prisoner of	343
Christ's College, Cambridge, oath taken at	81	...
Christopherson, Rev. H., and Athanasian Creed	378-9
Church a voluntary society	268
——— and Nonconformists	258
——— cause and Church party	45
——— council	181	...
——— in danger	3, 37
——— membership, Burke on	268
——— of England Monthly Review, 1859	317	...
——— orders, by Rev. J. Venables	406	...
——— Parliament	309	...
——— patronage, abuse of	106	...
——— disposal of	305
——— pyramid, top of the	336	...
——— questions, by Dr. Robinson, 1859	405	265
——— rate question, 1861-2	308	305
——— reforms, needed	304-6
——— reformers, fate of	300
Churching of women	157	318

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Class legislation	145
Cleaning the Church windows	150	131
Clergy, opinions of some of them, 1858	41	...
——— probable number of	16	69
Clergymen should not think	201
Clerical demonstration against revision, 1859-60	7
——— Journal on Revision, 1862	154
——— ——— and Ingoldsby	420	...
——— legislators	9
——— newspapers, their general character	131	...
——— oath a gag to the Clergy	54, 242	...
——— petitioners, one-sided	362	...
——— subscription, rigidity of	129
Clericus Lincolnensis, reply to, 1867	359
Close be your language, &c.	68	...
Close, Dean, and A. J. B. Hope, in conjunction	345
Coalition of Revisionists, 1860	201
Coarse insinuation and misplaced ridicule	103	207, 215
Cobden, a man of one idea	321
Cogent reason for revision	393	...
Coils of red tape	237	...
Colenso, Bishop, on candidates for orders	222, 227
——— on Pentateuch	175
Colonial Bishops, why "my lords?"	243	...
——— dioceses and the Prayer-book	245	...
Communion Service	318, 324
Commission, a Royal, asked for	62-3	347
——— of fifteen members	269, 343
——— 1689, constitution of	74	34
——— who to form one	160
Commissions of Inquiry, the order of the day	60	...
Common sense about the Church	22
——— ——— will have its way	77	...
Communion Service	317, 322
——— administration of	188
Compass and Church Reformer, 1861	300
Composition of supposed commission	348
Comprehension scheme, Revisionists'	193	...
——— Bishop of Oxford's idea of (1869)	147
——— recommended	36, 170
Compton, Tomline, Prideaux, Yorke, Paley, &c.	128	...
Conamur tenues grandia	265
Concessio principii	105, 240	...
Confessional in Belgravia, 1858	144	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Confessional at Oxford, 1862	56
Confirmation, order of	190
Con-Foeation, Terrible Priests of	418	...
Confound their politics, &c.	289
Confraternity of the Holy Cross, 1860	257	...
Consecration of bishops, service for	157	...
Construction of a commission	160
Consule Planeo	252, 360
Consummation of all things	157
Contra audentior ito	70	...
Controlling element of old age	94
Conventicle, the rant of the	298
Convict breeding grounds, 1862	278-9
Convocation, and the <i>Times</i> Newspaper, 1872	428	...
——— as it is, &c., 1859	285	...
——— and the Reformation	157
——— adjournment of, 1859	282	...
——— composition of	5	268
——— its abortive attempt to alter a Canon	285	...
——— powerless	157, 209
——— progress made in	309
——— reformed, 1878	431	79
——— obstructive capabilities of	326, 430	...
——— inadequate to the purpose	269	...
——— mode of election of proctors to, 1867	310	358
——— not a fair representative body	371
——— re-assembling of, Feb., 1859	270	...
——— represents the clergy, not the Church	284	...
Coplestone, Bishop, and the Reform Bill, 1832	93	172
Corn laws, how repealed, 1847	321
Cornwall Lewis to Mayor of Bath, 1860	143
Cornish, Rev. R., resignation of	22
Coxe, Venerable R. C., of Lindisfarne, 1858	246	...
Cramer's version of the Psalms	353	...
Craven, Archdeacon of, on revision, 1859	320	...
Cromwell, Oliver, a man of one idea	321
Cuddesdon College training ground	365
Cuncta terrarum subacta, &c.	283	...
Curtailment of the services	113
Daily Service, abridgment of	252	...
——— shorter form for	52	...
——— in diocese of Salisbury, 1859	369	...
Dame Partington and the Atlantic	131	...
Damnatory Clauses of Athanasian Creed	155, 174	187

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Damocles, sword of	295
Dancing attendance on Convocation	269
Danger of resisting too far	150
———— levels man and brute	175
Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar	258
———— come to judgment, 1858	152	...
Daniel's image	27
Dark prospect for the Church, 1861	269
David, young, and the giant Goliath, 1860	151
Davis, Rev. C. H., on revision	400	12
Davus sum non Œdipus	72	...
Day of little things	180
De excommunicato capiendo...	225
Dead flies cause the ointment, &c.	221
Dean Trench and the anti-revisionists, 1860	6
—— Pellew's six resolutions, 1861	273
Deans, not amongst the Ten Thousand	214
Deanery of York, 1858	106, 133	...
Dearly beloved brethren	353
Debate in House of Lords, May 8, 1860	83
Decius, the modern, 1859	346	...
Declaration of the Ten Thousand	25, 67
Decrease of candidates for Orders	384-7
Delay more dangerous than action	43, 150
Democritus and Heraclitus, schools of	134	...
Demosthenes on the shores of the Piræus	69	...
Denison, Archdeacon, examination for bishops	233
———— in Convocation	272
———— on Convocation	431	210
———— on Parliament; 1878	323
———— on the Prayer-book	412	...
Depunge ubi sistam	253	...
Derby, Lord, on the spirit of the age, 1858	54-5	...
Derbyshire petitioners, and Lord Ebury	59
———— Bishop of Oxford on	69
Derry and Raphoe, Bishop of, 1860	167
Desiderata in the Church	304-6
Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it	51
Deus ex machina	301	...
Device of the enemy, 1860	139
Devoted sons of the Church	261	...
Dextrum tempus for revision	131
Dictum sapienti	114	...
Difficile est proprie communia dicere	258

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Difficulty, the greatest of all... ..	413	160
Dignity, chastity, and severity of the Church	309
Diis aliter visum	274	...
Dilapidations, question of, 1878	305
Dimidium facti qui bene cœpit habet	167	...
Diocesan Home Mission	236	...
Diram qui contudit Hydram... ..	363	...
Directorium Anglicanum	356	...
Discoverer, definition of one	312
Disraeli, educator of the Tories, 1858	121	...
—— on Church matters, 1861	362	...
Dissatisfaction with the Prayer-Book as it is ...	87	...
Dissolution of Parliament, April, 1859	296-301	...
Distrust of Parliament	265	...
Divide et impera	277	...
Division of services impracticable in country ...	154	...
Doctrinal revision, effect of	99
—— and non-doctrinal revision	323	199
Dodgson, Archdeacon, on the Prayer-book, 1860	118
Dogs of war, let slip	301	...
Dorsetshire Squire and the <i>Times</i> newspaper ...	132	...
Double duty, in country villages	359
Draco of nineteenth century, 1859	369	...
Dress, clerical, rubric on	356	...
Dublin Anatomical School	133, 335
—— Revision Association... ..	304	262
—— Review of Ingoldsby Letters, 1859	419	...
Dulness an unpardonable offence	131	359
Dum memor ipse mei, &c.	328	...
Duncombe, Hon. Augustus, Dean of York	110	...
Dungannon, Lord, in House of Lords, May, 1862...	...	334
Durham, Bishop of (Baring), on Revision...	158
Earliest Catholic times	83	...
Early reformers, spirit of	109
—— celebrations	239, 255	...
Easter, abridgment of Services at	155	...
Eastward position, forbidden	368
Ebb of Revision question	152
Ebury, Lord, motion of May 6, 1858	89	...
—— in House of Lords, May 8, 1860	81-93
—— July 22, 1861	274
—— and debate of May 27, 1862	332
—— and <i>Saturday Review</i> , Feb., 1862	320
—— and the Derbyshire petitioners, 1860	58

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Ebury Lord, before his age	365	...
———— episcopal testimony to, 1858-60 ...	350	...
———— his bill of 1863	344-46
———— his two bills of 1862	312
———— <i>Morning Post</i> and, 1858-9	132, 363	...
———— on a Royal Commission	149
———— on our convict breeding grounds	278
———— on repetitions in the service	315	...
———— portrait of, 1860	85, 90
Ebury pill and Ingoldsbj gilding, 1861	48
Ecce iterum Crispinus	90	...
—— quam jucundum	206	...
Eccentric and nebulous affair of Convocation ...	339	...
Ecclesiastical architecture	355	...
Ecclesiastical Commission, its constitution... ..	63	...
———— and Church dignities	108	...
———— one effect of	234	...
———— working of	266, 306
<i>Edinburgh Review</i> and Revision, 1861	308
———— and subscription, 1861	261
Editio expurgata of the Prayer-book	154	...
Edward VI., the first Liturgy of	36, 356	...
———— commission under	269	...
Eel-catching in Lincolnshire...	277
Egregio inspersos corpore naevos	153	...
Eheu fugaces, Posthume, Posthume	160	...
Ejection of the Puritans in 1662	267, 391
Elapsa est anguilla	103	...
Elasticity in the Church services	341	...
Elderly clergy, statu-quoists	344	...
Eldon, Sibthorp, and Wetherell	173
Elizabeth, Act of Uniformity under	361	...
Embryos and idiots, eremites and friars	375	...
En avant	197
<i>English Churchman</i> newspaper, 1858	140-44	...
———— Nonconformity, Vaughan on	269
Entering the Church as a profession	379-87
Envy will merit, as its shade, pursue	134	...
Epaminondas, saying of	68	...
Ephraim is joined to idols	333
Episcopacy, increase of, 1877-8	306
Episcopal Draco of 1859	369	...
———— incomes not excessive	231
———— juggler, the, 1859	341	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Episcopal patronage	201	...
——— unanimity	207	159
Epistles and Gospels, selection of	188
Errare malim cum Platone, &c.	191	...
Essays and Reviews, by whom encouraged	55
——— origin of	254-6
Est aliquid quo tendis?	300
—— brevitate opus, ut currat sententia	68	...
Et tu, Brute	147	...
Euodias and Syntyche	327	...
Eurekamen, curekamen	178	...
Evangelical candidates for Orders	381
——— dean, 1859	335	...
Evasit, excessit, erupit	378	...
Eve of St. Nicholas, 1860	257	...
Every letter of that cost me a guinea	302
——— one's business, no one's business	302	...
Examination for bishoprics, &c., 1861	233
——— into the Pentateuch (Colenso)	175
Exceptio probat regulam	345
Excrescence, excision of	133
Exitus acta probat	157
Exodus of 1662	147, 259
Expansive scheme of Christianity	245	...
Expellas furem, tamen usque recurret	388
Expertus disces quam gravis iste labor	318	...
Expounding Scripture Lessons	289
Expectata dies aderat; May, 1860...	81
Ex-rural dean, and ex-minister	57
Extempore prayer	290-1
Extravagantly ridiculous	314
Fabian policy	183, 411	...
Facts and documents	260	...
Fair weather, the occasional prayer for	294	...
Faint, yet pursuing; Dec., 1878	387
Faith, hope, and charity of the bishops	205
Farewell; and if a better system 's thine, &c.	182	391
Fas est et ab hoste doceri	308	279
Feathers' Tavern Association, 1772	80	...
Feeble men, promotion of	333	...
Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum	93	...
Fens and fogs of Lincolnshire	172	296
Festina lente, slow but sure	146	...
Fiat justitia, ruat cælum	99, 340

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Filioque, Bishop of Oxford on, 1860	170
Finality, doctrine of	103
Fisher and Gell, Messrs.	264
Fisher's "Liturgical Purity our Inheritance" ...	59, 91	...
Fisherophobia	59	...
Five points of the Revision charter, 1860	199
Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo	195
Flexibility in the services, needed	321	...
Flowers, scattering on the grave, origin of ...	128	...
Fons et origo mali	39
Foreign missions, questions on, 1877	367
Formality in religion	231	...
Formulae of past thinkings	254
Frailty, thy name is Thirlwall, 1858	173	...
Fraser, Bishop, on the Articles, 1878	193
Freemasons' Hall, meeting at, 1860	82
Freezing common sense	282
Fremantle, Rev. W., letter to the Record ...	260	...
Frigida pugnabant calidis, &c.	74	...
From the author, 1857	170	...
Frondsberg, Knight of, 1860	89
Full many a gem, &c.	214	...
Fumum et opes strepitumque Romæ	153	...
Funeral near Market Rasen, Lincolnshire, 1860 ...	257	...
Gallios among the Laity	141
Garibaldi a Liberal-Conservative	122
Garotters, Lord Ebury on	278
Gatton and Old Sarum of the Church	122, 274
———— of Prayer-book	173
Ganden, Dr., in 1660	367	...
Gell, Rev. Philip, on the Liturgy	54-60
General election, 1859	392	...
General Wade	235
Genus irritabile clericorum	131	...
George III., and repetitions in our service ...	188, 191	...
German neology, 1860	174
Germ of Popery in the Prayer-book	229
Get you to your burdens	49	...
Getting over scruples as well as you can	128, 261
Ghost of Liturgical reform	163	...
Girdlestone, Rev. Charles, and the bishops ...	209	...
———— on the present time	43
———— Negative Theology	251
Give peace in our time	159	15

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Gloucester and Bristol (Baring), Bishop of, 1860	...	158
Gnosius Rhadamanthus	6
"God save the Queen," in Church	285, 289
Goderich, Lord, on timely concession, 1831	...	171
Godfathers and godmothers, at baptism	220, 237
Gordian knot of the Prayer-book	189, 387
Graceless spells	87
Graham, Bishop, and the <i>Times</i> , 1859	371	...
——— Dr., as Master of Christ's	373	209
Granville, Earl, 1860	141, 145
Gratiano and Bishop Graham, 1859	371	...
Great is Diana of the Ephesians	200
Gregory Nazianzen on Synods	2	...
Grosvenor, Lord Robert, petition of 1857	21	14
——— in House of Commons, 1857	298	...
——— major and minor, 1862	324
Gunpowder plot, service for	221	...
Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed sæpe cadendo	414	...
Habits of devotion, want of	45	...
Hæ nugæ seria ducunt in mala	261, 354	...
Halmemamm's disciples	78	...
Hale, Sir Matthew, and 39 Articlees	194
Half better than the whole	36, 189	...
Halifax, Vicar of, 1859	319-20	...
Halter round your neck (Paley)	334, 416	248
Hampden, Rev. Renn Dickson, 1859	335	...
Hangman's wife and her husband	131	...
Hare, Archdeacon, on subscription	407	...
Harmlessness of the Ingoldsby Letters	119	...
Harvest plenteous, but labourers few	387
Hand ignarn' mali miseris sucemrere disco	40	...
Have all, tyme all	198
Havelock and Livingstone	275
He being dead, yet speaketh, 1860	17, 298
He that is down need not to fear a fall	290	...
He will not forsake thee	89
Heads of colleges, unanimity of	207	...
Hear from the grave, renowned Eldon, hear	...	173
Heaven hath a hand in these events	116	...
Hebert, Rev. Charles, on subscription, 1862	...	340
Herbert Peterborough, 1822, 1861	240, 362
HERE	302
Hereford, Bath and Wells, and Chichester	334	...
Hereford, Bishop of, 1859	335	...

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Hesiod, aphorism of... ..	319	...
Hi motus animorum, &c.	270	...
Hic et ubique (Samuel Wilberforce)	340	...
High and low pitch of devotion	47	...
High Church journalism, 1859	272	...
———— and Low Church	45
High Churchman on the Church, 1860	22
Highways, how to mend, 1846-7	156
Hilary on Creeds	256
Hinc illæ lacrymæ	213	...
Hobgoblin of Revision, 1860	124
Holy Communion Service, a compromise	389
—— week, shorter lessons and Gospels for	155	...
Homo trium literarum, 1860...	104
Homœopathic reform...	271, 319
Honorary Canons	212	305
Hook, Dr., not one of the Ten Thousand	213
Hooker, as an authority	182
Hooper, Bishop, on canonical habits	357	...
Hope, Alexander Beresford, and the Church	46
———— liberality of...	52
———— in the House of Commons, 1859... ..	25, 298	...
———— and Revision, 1863-78	307	345
Hope tells a flattering tale	143
—— the fool's paradise	210	...
House of Cards	149	...
———— Commons, why dumb on the subject	142
Howson, Dean, and Athanasian Creed, 1873	373-5
Hull, W. W., on Church matters	361	...
Humanum est errare	105	...
Hypocrisy and nonsense have got, &c.	399	...
I forgive you	151	...
I love, I too, the Church, 1860	117
I never thought to hear you speak again, 1862	336
I nunc et versus tecum meditare canoros	301	...
If it were na weel bobbitt, we'll bob it again	93
If we say A, we must say B, 1860-72	60, 363
If you'd seen these roads before they were made	235
I'll rant as well as thou	145
Illâ se jactet in aulâ	221	...
Ille per extensum funem, &c.	287
Illegible handwriting of bishops, &c., 1859	402	...
Illic, ut perhibent, aut intempesta silet nox	299	...
Illicios intra muros peccatur et extra	77	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Imperium in Imperio...	143
Impulsive Church reformer...	...	49
In hoc signo vineetis	56
Ineuleanda repetenda...	367	...
Indeed he wrote such a book	324	...
Indelibility of holy orders	226
<i>Independent Press</i> , Cambridge, Review of Ingoldsby Letters	...	392
Indian rebellion, outbreak of	299	...
Indignor quicquam reprehendi, non quia, &c.	131	...
Indomitable perseverance	53	...
Infelix, utemque ferent ea facta minores	392	...
Ingenium velox, audacia perdita	65	...
Ingoldsby and <i>Edinburgh Review</i>	308
—— his occupation gone	333, 343
—— Letters, harmlessness of	119, 415	...
—— apology for	411—417	...
—— Review of	419	...
—— his graver treatises	124	...
Injudicious friends of the Church	104	...
Injunction to the diocese of Oxford, Oct., 1862	167
Inquisitorial Bishops and Rural Deans, 1873	361
Intoning and chanting in parish churches	382	...
Introductory sentences	185
Ipsa mutatio consuetudinis, &c.	152, 197	...
Ipsissima verba	308
Irish amendments on the Prayer-book	263
—— bishoprics confiscated	225	...
Iron sleet of arrowy shower	92
Ist, -an, and -ite	180
Ist's Gottes werk, so wird's bestehen	345	...
It is excellent to have a giant's strength	48	...
It is too late	143	...
It must be put down, and it shall, 1859	383, 397	...
It will not let us alone	311
Jacke o' both sides, 1859	276, 280	...
Jacob's voice and Esau's hands	218	...
Jamque opus exegi, 1863	343
Janus Bifrons, a modern illustration of, 1858	101	...
Jeremy Taylor, on Athanasian Creed	182
Jewel that, the Prayer-book	67	...
Jews, infidels, and heretics	106
Johnson, Dr., saying of, on objections	295	...
Junction of three services	31	...
Justification, article on	235

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Kennedy Dr., of Shrewsbury	227	...
Killing a dead cat	339	...
King George III., and the Church services ...	188, 191	...
— of France with 20,000 men	282	...
Kingswinford, Rector of	194, 203	...
Kingsworthy, Rector of	329, 334	...
Kirkby Stephen, rural deanery of	35
Knight's Census, applied to the Clergy	13	...
Laity, their culpable apathy on revision	357	114, 141
— must take the initiative	266
Language given to disguise thoughts	71	...
Lapse of years and altered circumstances	105	...
Larga quidem, Drance, semper, &c.	65	...
Lasciate ogni speranza	301
Lathbury Rev. Thomas, and the Dissenters	64
— on the Prayer-book	77
Laud Archbishop, and Dr. Leighton	419	...
— and the Puritans	267
— the would-be, of 1862	151
Laughing and crying philosophers	134	...
Lavington, early ritualism at	147
Lawless and irreligious mob	379, 386	...
Lawyers' correspondence	190	...
Lay element wanting in Convocation	110
Layman's thoughts on the Church	227
Le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle	303, 336	...
Learned leisure	235	...
Leaves from my journal, Lord Robert Grosvenor	402	...
Lectionary, New, of 1872-79	331	...
Lectures, public, on revision	215
Legislation in the dog-days	223	...
Leighton Dr., and Archbishop Laud	419	...
Length of the Church Service	41	230
Lenit albescens animos capillus	360
Less educated poor	95	...
Lessons, choice and abridgment of	316, 328
— mode of reading	389	...
— table of	185
Let every man be fully persuaded	178
— him alone	333
— ill alone	289, 348	...
— well alone	360	...
— me be loved, Let me be feared	267
— none object my lingering way	411	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Let the gall'd jade wince, &c.	267	...
—— the Prayer-book alone	373	...
———— be revised	41
Let-well-aloners of 1774, 1689	56, 75	...
Letting I dare not wait upon I would	102, 197	...
Liddon Canon, Letter on the Athanasian Creed	378
Like will to like	11
Limbo of vanities	298	...
Limerick, Bishop of, on revision, 1857	10	...
Lincoln, Bishop of, in Convocation... ..	11, 28-32	...
—— Charge of, Oct., 1858	238, 251	...
—— a moderate revisionist	97
—— on Burial Service	408	...
—— on revision	19, 60	...
Lincoln diocese of, its magnitude	16	...
—— election of proctors for	309	356
Lincolnshire clergy, Petition of	11, 15	...
—— dykes, eel-catching in...	277
—— Rector, reply to, 1867	359
Lindisfarne, Archdeacon of, 1858	246	...
Lion in the path	176	...
Litany to be disjoined from rest of Service	316	185, 310
Literates, as candidates for orders	384
Littera scripta manet... ..	129	...
Little things, day of	180
Liturgia Recusa	49, 342
Liturgical Purity our Rightful Inheritance	165	...
—— Reformers and the elections	302	...
Liturgy and Dissenters, Isaac Taylor, 1860	60
—— and Canons too unbending	279
Livingstone and Havelock	275
Liverpool, petition of 10,000 from	291, 303	...
Llandaff, Bishop, Charge of, 1860	165
—— Bishop of, on length of the service	313	...
Loaves and fishes of the Church	17	...
Locke on the understanding... ..	135	...
London, Bishop of, his primary Charge, 1858	233	...
—— in House of Lords, 1858	226	...
—— 1860	125
—— his Charge of 1862	339
—— on subscription	255, 340
Long prayers, objection to	251	...
Longley Dr., and Athanasian Creed	209
Look ye there, now, <i>but</i> again	176	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Loosing and retention of sins	48
Lord's Prayer, repetition of	186, 327
———— omitted before sermon	7	...
Lords Thurlow and Eldon	199	...
Lords, atmosphere of House of	299	...
Love of peace	347	...
Lucretius, the doctor in	293
Ludum insolentem ludere pertinax	273	...
Lushington Dr., his judgment	248
Luther, a modern	89
Lyttelton Lord, in the House of Lords, 1860	101
———— and Ebury, Lords, correspondence of	358	...
Macadam The, of the Church, 1862	313
Macaulay, on revision of 1689	375	...
MacNeile Dean, and Athanasian Creed, 1873	373
Magee Bishop, on morbid activity, 1878	362
Magnæ mentis opus, &c.	236	...
Mahon Lord, on Convocation	140
———— seized a flambeau, 1858	224	...
Manchester, Bishop of (Prince Lee), on Holy Orders	226
———— (Fraser), on Thirty-nine Articles	193
Manibus date lilia plenis, &c.	128	...
Manifesto of the Ten Thousand, 1860	177, 212
Mann Mr., tables of Census	62
Many-headed monster, Liturgical Reform	160	...
Marsden Rev. J. R., on candidates for orders	384
Marsh Bishop, and eighty-seven questions	233, 361
Martin Chancellor, a Revisionist	295	...
Massingberd Rev. F. C., on Burial Service	412	...
———— in Convocation, 1861	272
———— on the Prayer-book	309, 326	75, 77
Matins and Evensong	365	...
Matrimony, solemnization of	156	191, 318
Medes and Persians, laws of	98	...
Meeke Rev. R., on Act of Uniformity	332
Meetings on Revision, 1859-60	275	81
Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin	403	...
Men's minds disturbed	73, 78	...
Merses profundo, pulchrior evenit	162	...
Messner H., on Liturgical Revision	262
Methodism, Sydney Smith on	299
Metropolis, spiritual destitution in, 1862	278
Midnight service at St. Michael's, Brighton	357	...
Millenary petitioners of 1693	248	211

				VOL. I.	VOL. II.
				PAGE	PAGE
Millinery department in the Church	355	...
Milman Dean, of St. Paul's, 1861	214
Milne Rev. R. M., on the clerical oath	82	...
Mind of the Church known	283	...
Minute, perplexing, insignificant, useless	333
Miremur te non tua, &c.	136	...
Misplaced ridicule	206, 215
Missions Foreign, questions on, 1877	366
Mitred fathers in long order go	273	...
Mixed commission of clergy and laity	144
Mobilitate viget, &c....	358	...
Moderate revision advocated	168
Modern Cato, The, 1859	283	...
Momus and the slippers of Venus...	324
Monkey and chestnuts, fable of	65	360
Monte decurrens velut amnis, &c.	88	...
Montfaucon Father, on Athanasian Creed	207
Monthly communion and weekly offertory	254	...
Morbid activity of bishops, 1878	362
More kicks than halfpence to Reformers...	300
Morgan Rev. R., on Church in Wales	288	...
<i>Morning Post</i> and Lord Ebury, 1859	132, 363	...
Morning Service, the length of	25, 32, 154, 315	...
Mountains and molehills	11, 147
Mountfield, Rev. D., "Two Hundred Years ago"	8, 218	...
———— on revision of Canons and Liturgy	100
———— Church and Nonconformists of 1662	258-61
Much ado about nothing	219	...
Much cry, but no wool	326	...
Mumbo Jumbo, enactment of, to perfection	334
Mumpsimus class of divines	45	...
Musgrave Archdeacon, Charge of, 1859	320	...
Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur	156
Mutual confidence and mutual aid...	166
Nam tua res agitur paries, &c.	119	...
Nasty noises from nasty mouths	217	...
Natal Bishop of, on Burial Service	133
National Church, definition of	115	...
———— manual for	193
Nay, never shake thy gory locks at me	114	...
Ne quid detrimenti capiat Liturgia	3
Neal on Commission of 1689	256
Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel	258
Nebulous and eccentric body	339, 352	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Need that exists for revision of the Liturgy ...	104	...
Needless alterations to be rejected	163
"Negative Theology," by Rev. C. Girdlestone	251
Nelson Lord, and Church Institution, 1859	3
Never changes but for the worse ...	197	...
—— make a difficulty ...	195	...
Nevile Rev. C., and the Prayer-book	241
—— resignation of	246
New Lectionary of 1872-79... ...	331	...
—— Prayer-book, optional use of	390
Newcome Archbishop, on the Bible version ...	330	...
Newman on Creeds	187
Nicene Creed, Jeremy Taylor on	182
Nihil est ab omni parte beatum ...	338	156
Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se, &c. ...	342	...
—— sine magno labore	161
—— ultra quo jam progrediatur habet	226
Niobe and her little one, 1862	333
Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ ...	423	...
No man need scruple anything in the Church	251
"No peace with Rome!" was once the shout ...	377	...
No Popery, no semi-Popery ...	383	...
No surrender	173
Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari	15
Non-doctrinal Revisionists ...	192, 322	...
Non-natural interpretation ...	166	...
Non mihi si linguæ centum, &c. ...	217	...
—— omnia præstanda parentibus...	94
—— possumus omnes ...	401	...
—— quam multum, sed quam bene ...	32	...
—— quia vexari quenquam, &c.	252
—— tali auxilio ...	418	...
Nonconformists, number of in 1676	106
—— ejected in 1662	259, 391
Norwich Dean of, on the Calendar, 1857 ...	331	...
—— in Convocation, 1861	211, 270
—— on revision, 1861 ...	351	32
Not a new objection	136
—— at the present time ...	104, 151	344
—— less their number than, &c.	74
—— touching the Prayer-book	324
—— worth the cost	97
—— yet, not yet, not yet ...	163	...
Notes to bishops' charges ...	126	...

		VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Nothing so incautious as doing nothing	352	...
Notice to be given to the Ordinary	329
Nous avons changé tout cela	209
November the 5th, Service for, 1858	147, 221	...
Now, if ever, the proper time	164
Nuisance, proper time for removing	335
Nunc dimittis	302	...
O vanas hominum mentes, &c.	109	...
Oath taken at Christ's College, Cambridge	81	...
Objections against all change	117
———— not new ones	136
———— to Revision	241	...
Obscuro positus loco	156
Occasional Services of the Church ...	50, 156, 294	...	169
Occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros	69	...
Off with his head	180	...
Oh, mark ye here a brave and loyal knight	87
— that my enemy would write a book	281	...
Old men forget, &c.	337	...
— things are passing away	277
Oldknow Rev. Joseph, of Birmingham	396	...
Oliver Cromwell	364	...
Olla podrida, specimen of	405	...
Omission construed as rejection	120
Omitting the sermon	252	...
Omne ignotum pro magnifico	95	...
—— tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci	135	...
—— vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus, &c.	280	...
Omnia dat, qui justa negat	79, 113	...
—— fatis in pejus ruere, &c.	147	...
—— me adversum spectantia, &c.	171	...
Once more unto the breach, &c.	40
One man soweth, another reapeth	302
— more such victory, and we are undone	336
— touch of nature makes the whole, &c.	208	...
On me, when dunces are satiric, &c.	145	...
Onus, non honor	305
Open questions	186	...
Opening the Scripture and finding a place	33	...
Opposing everything, proposing nothing	104
Optime nati, mediocriter docti	268
Optional use of the New Book	355, 390
Ora pro anima	396	...
Oracles not dumb	371	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Orby Shipley, pervert to Rome, 1878	73
Ordaining of priests, form of	237
Order of Morning Prayer	185
Orders, candidates for, from University	385
—— indelibility of	225
—— reluctance to enter into	176, 380
Ordination service, length of	50, 318	...
———scrupled at	19
———services	157	...
Organ of order, deficiency in	401	...
Ornaments of the Church and ministers	352, 368
Ornatio, accuratio, brevior, &c.	348	...
Othello's occupation gone, 1862	333
Otium sine dignitate	203	156
Out upon these jugglers	291	...
Overwhelming majority	69
Oxenden Rev. A., in Convocation, 1861	309, 327
Oxford and Cambridge candidates for orders	329
Oxford, Bishop of, his first appearance	65	...
———Charge of, 1860	171, 238
———in Convocation, 1860	38
———in the House of Lords, May, 1858	82, 90	...
———in House of Lords, May, 1860	145
———objects to any alteration	151	...
———third time of asking	215	...
Oxon, on Bishop Tait's Speech, 1860	129, 130
Paley Archdeacon, on subscription	348-9	...
———and the halter	334, 416	248
———and the old woman	197	...
———on Revision	416	...
Palmerston Lord, as Prime Minister	94
Pamphlets, pro and con revision	76
Paper Duty, removal of, 1861	85	...
Parents, as sponsors in baptism	319
Parish clerk, office of	392	...
Parliament, Tractarian distrust of, 1860	265	...
———miscellaneous creed of its members	302
Parliamentum terebratum or terebrantium	321
Parsons' burlesque of Parliament	282	330
Parties in the Church	45
Parturiunt montes, &c.	426	...
Parvus Iulus dat comitem, 1859	340	...
Passion week, Monday and Tuesday in	155	...
Pastor Aristæus and the sea-god	177	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Patrick, Burnet, Tillotson, Beveridge, Lloyd, &c.	128	...
Patrick Cheyne, Rev., of Aberdeen, 1860	...	72
Patronage of the Bishops	202	...
———, laudable example of, 1858	214	...
Pattison Mark, on Church formulæ	...	254
Paul St., on Mars'-hill	...	287
Pazienza poi	131	...
Peace in our time	159, 204	15
——— when there is no peace	...	66
Peculiar views of truth	97	183
Pellew Dean, in Convocation, 1859	351	272
People's call for a revision of the Liturgy	168	...
Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ	...	53
Perit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus, &c.	...	244
Permissive Bill of 1862	...	326
Perpetuating defects	245	...
Perrupit Acheronta Hercules labor	137	...
Persta atque obdura, &c.	137	...
Perverts to Popery, 1859	261	...
Petinusque damusque vicissim	133	...
Petition of Lincolnshire Clergy, 1857	13	...
Petitions on Revision, 1859...	275	...
Pharsalia, battle of	376	...
Philosophising upon subscription	...	261
Philpott, Bishop of Worcester, on Revision, 1862	...145, 153, 337	...
Phrenological development of a Ritualist	395	...
Pictoribus atque poetis quidlibet audendi, &c.	...	149
Pleasures are like poppies spread, &c.	183	...
Political chameleon, 1859	296	...
Poole <i>versus</i> the Bishop of London	144, 338	...
———, Rev., his appeal, 1859	297	...
Poor, weak, miserable agitation	213	...
Pope Gregory, and St. Augustine...	245	...
Popery without a Pope	383	...
———, germs of, in the Prayer-book	...	229
Populus me sibilat, &c.	217	...
——— vult decipi et decipietur	371	...
Porteus Bishop, advocate for Revision	127	...
Position of great responsibility	...	42
Post-prandial celebrations	321	238
Postures, and impostures	390	...
Powys Hon. and Rev. Atherton Legh	375	...
Practical grievance and practical good	...	131
Praise undeserved, &c.	179	...
Prayer-book, by the Rev. R. Bingham	...	348

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Prayer-book, miscellaneous contents of ...	407	...
———— remodelled	183
Prayer for the dead ...	396	...
Prayers for the sick	191
Preach shorter sermons (Bishop Graham) ...	373	...
Preacher, art of	293
Preaching in chains	295
———— in theatres ...	237	...
———— without full service	319
Preferment, the wrong road to ...	415	...
Preliminary inquiry ...	361	...
Presbyter Lincolnensis, Letter by, 1867	367
Present temper of men's minds ...	71	...
———— time, this ...	151	164
Presentation copy of a Bishop's Charge ...	171	...
Presentment on the Canons, 1862	304
Press, opinion of, on Revision ...	346	...
Presumptuous men, 1859 ...	261	...
Prince bishops, and their clergy ...	169	...
Principiis obsta ...	259, 386	...
Private confession at Oxford, 1862	56
Privy Council, and Gorham case	264
Prizes in the Church ...	106	...
Processional cross, 1859 ...	260	...
Proctors, election of, to Convocation ...	309	306
———— for the Diocese of Lincoln, 1867 ...	310-313	356
———— in Convocation	9
Programme of Revision Association, 1862	202
Progressionist Church tracts, 1858 ...	111	...
Proinde tona eloquio, solet tibi	145
Prolocutor and Gravamina	80
Promised a play, but dwindled to a farce	75
Proof of the pudding in the eating ...	400	299
Prospects for the future, 1863	343
Proteus, the Episcopal, 1858 ...	101	...
Provoking to jealousy by them that are no church	279, 297
Psalms and Lessons	316-28
Psalter, different arrangement of ...	157, 353	186
Public opinion, the best test of a measure ...	89	...
———— Worship Bill of 1862 (Lord Ebury)	313, 319
Pudet hæc opprobria dici potuisse ...	214, 265	...
Purchas Rev. John, and clerical dress ...	356	...
Puritan discipline tracts ...	418	...
Puseyite funeral in Lincolnshire, 1860 ...	257	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Quality not quantity... ..	253	...
<i>Quarterly Review</i> and Canon Wodehouse ...	407	...
————— for Jan., 1834	215	...
Queen Mary, Bishops of	173
Qui Bavium non odit, &c.	54
Qui color albus erat, nunc est contrarius albo ...	335	...
Qui jacet in terrâ non habet unde cadat ...	290	...
Qui s'excuse s'accuse	102, 218	216
Quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi ...	131	...
Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu	146
Quiet friends of Reform	333	...
Quieta non movere	412	37
Quin damus id superis quod, &c.	232	...
Quintilian, on child and parent	93
Quis talia fando temperet a lacrymis	315	...
Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit, &c. ...	85	...
Quorum pars magna fuit	217	...
Radical Church Reformer of 1862	277
"Ravencross," a poem, extracts from	187, 192, 269	...
Reading and expounding Scripture	289
Real danger in resisting	150
Reform Bill of 1831-32, Authors of	113	...
———— of Convocation, 1872	428	...
Reformation The, and Convocation	157
Reformed Episcopal Church of England and Ireland ...	99, 138, 277	...
Reformers: their fate, as a rule	301
Religious disturbances at St. George's-in-the-East 379-399
———— revolution, the danger of	99	...
Reluctance to enter holy orders	177
Remember the 5th of November	221	...
Repetitions, alleged advantage of	327
Repose will not be allowed us	247, 271	...
Resignation of Canon Wodehouse, 1860	17
———— Rev. R. P. Cornish, 1862	22
Resist innocent alterations by all means	173, 198
Rest, rest, perturbed spirit... ..	163	...
Retreat of the Ten Thousand, 1860	75
Retrospect of revision for 1858	271	...
———— for 1859	1
Retrospect for 1860	211
———— for 1861	307
———— from 1858 to 1863	343
Review of the Ingoldsby Letters, 1859, 1862 ...	419	392
Reviewer The, reviewed	152

			VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Revised Prayer-book of 1852 and 1878	138-9
Revision Association, 1860	195
——— desirable and desired	175, 321	...
——— effect on candidates for Holy orders	177, 383
——— nut, not cracked yet, 1878	387
——— previous attempts at	298	...
——— publications in 1863, number of	345
——— question, progress of, 1859-60	301	91
Revisionists not agreed amongst themselves	276	...
Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat	119, 421	...
Ridicule, a two-edged sword	206
——— will frequently prevail	130, 376, 421	...
Rigid subscription cannot be enforced	275
Riots at St. George's-in-the-East, 1859	379, 399	...
Risks attending change	173
Ritual Commission, Report of, 1867-70	426	...
Ritualism, progress of, 1860	5
Rival Parliament over the way	137
Rivals The, in House of Lords, 1860	147
Robinson Rev. Dr., and "Church Questions"	405	265
Roma semper eadem...	377	...
Romanism within the Church, 1878	388
Romulus et Liber pater	364	...
Royal Commission of 1689	74, 332	...
———, scope of	154, 361	348
———, suggested constitution of	63, 269	...
——— the only remedy	187	184, 334
Royal supremacy, by Rev. D. Mountfield	143
Rubicon of subscription, passage of, 1861	197, 275
Rubric requires an entire revision	157, 409	...
Rubrical revisionists	192	119
Rupture in the Church	79	...
Rural dean, office of	212	305
——— deans, inquisitorial, 1873	368
——— simplicity, 1858	94	...
Ruri-decanal chapter at Bridport, 1860	368	...
Russell Earl, on Lord Ebury, May 27, 1862	409	...
——— and Lord Shaftesbury, 1862	334
Rusticus expectat dum defluat annis	73	209
Sacheverell, cry of, 1861	271
Sadler's Wells of the Church	299
Sailing N. by N.E., and S. by S.W., 1858	102	...
St. Asaph, Bishop of, on burial service, 1858	281	...
——— and the Prayer-book, 1859	324	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
St. Barnabas, Pimlico, 1860... ..	262	...
St. David's, Bishop of, No. I.—No. II. ...	99, 124	...
———— an anti-Reformer, 1858 ...	183, 195	...
———— and occasional services ...	292-4	...
———— Bishop of, his Charge of 1860	204
St. George's-in-the-East, 1859	354, 379	...
———— disturbances at ...	379-399	...
St. Michael's, Brighton, service at, 1874 ...	357	...
St. Paul's Church, Brighton, 1861	384-5	...
———— Knightsbridge, 1860	264	...
Salisbury, Bishop of, on Revision, 1858 ...	366	...
———— on daily service	369	...
Sancroft, Stillingfleet, Tenison, Wake, &c. ...	127	...
Sanderson Bishop, and the Prayer-book	36
<i>Saturday Review</i> , and Lord Ebury, 1862	320
Save me from my friends	137, 211	...
Savoy Conference, 1661	327	254
Schedule to Permissive Bill, 1862	315
Schismatic Act of Uniformity, 1662	279
Schleiermacher, introduction to	325	...
Scilicet et tempus veniet, &c.	94	...
Scruples, get over as well as you can, 1860	128
Seeker Archbishop, on Revision in 1761 ...	70, 349	...
Sed enim gelidus tardaute senectâ, &c.	251
— non nunc erat his locus	149
Sedgwick Professor, saying of	399	...
Seen too oft, familiar with its face, &c. ...	262	...
Sentiments of the deans on Revision, 1860	213
Sequiturque virum non passibus æquis ...	340	...
Sermon, the length of	33	...
Servetur ad unum qualis ab incepto, &c....	168	...
Service, the length of	37	...
Services, division and order of	315
Seymour Henry, and Ecclesiastical Commission	226	266
Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego	283
Shaftesbury and Russell, Earls, May 27, 1862	334
She'll close and be herself again	387
Sherlock at Temple taking a boat	213	...
Sherlock's Test Act vindicated	106
Shibboleth of a party	308
Short sermons and long services	253	...
Should I all recount, &c.	210
Si quid novisti rectius istis, candidus imperti ...	182	391
Sibthorp Colonel, and Sir Charles Wetherell	173

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Sibylline books, principle of, 1860	86
Sic ego torrentem, qua nil obstat eunti, &c. ...	115	...
— vita erat, &c.	347	...
— volo, sic jubeo	267
Sicelides Musæ, paullo majora canamus	82	...
Signs of land approaching	140	...
Simile gaudet simili	11
Simony, oath against	223-24
Sir William Jones, saying of	195	...
Sisera, mother of, returning answer to herself	132
Sit down like a man and have it out	124
Sive Aquilo radit terras, &c.	270	...
Slow process, but sure in end	390
Small toothed comb	145	...
Smile, and smile, and smile and be a villain ...	120	...
Snake The, scotched, not killed, 1878	387
Solemnisation of matrimony	156	318, 331
Solid arguments	121	...
Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant	383	...
Solon laws of, enacted for 100 years	97, 173	...
Something is wanting	98	...
Sovereign cannot take the initiative	184
Speak of me as I am, &c.	392	...
Speaking on both sides, 1862	138
Special Services	317, 329
—— Committee of Convocation	343	...
Specify what you want	29
Spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici... ..	341	...
Spoke, spoke	216	...
Sponsorial stipulation	237
Sponsors, the number of	189
——, parents to be admitted as, at baptism...	319
Springtide of Revision question	152
Spurgeon, An hour with, 1861	285-299
Spurgeonise the Church	297, 351
Stanhope Lord, and State services, 1858	224	...
—— Earl, on Revision, 1860	140
Stanley Professor, on candidates for ordination	177
—— Bishop, on subscription, 1840	94	47
Stans pede in uno, 1858	67	...
Stat nominis umbra, 1860	207
State your grievance and the proposed remedy	183
State services expunged, 1858	147, 221	...
Statistics of different sects, 1851-61	63

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Stephens, Dr. A. J., on Act of Uniformity, 1862	...	43
———— on black gown in preaching	372
———— opinion of, on Convocation ...	269	...
Stereotyping subscription	342
Steuart Mr. A., M.P. for Cambridge, 1862	...	25
Still going blind, as Premiers lead him	321
—— must I on, 1859-78	271	387
Stonehouse, Archdeacon, a Revisionist ...	320	...
Stridulous grasshopper sitting up aloft ...	271	151
Strike me, but hear me, 1860	151
—— while the iron is hot	137	...
Structural Revision of the Prayer-book	350
Stubbs, Rev. Mr., 1861	299
Sub rege Medo	373	...
Subdivision of dioceses, 1877-8	306
Subscription, Archdeacon Paley on	333	...
———— Bishop of London (Tait) on	340
———— enlarged form of, suggested	341
———— to Canon XXXVI.	221
Such is the moral of all human tales ...	349	...
Such were the sounds that through, &c. ...	97	...
Suggestions for a Royal Commission, 1858	153	...
Summa petit livor, perflant altissima venti	...	320
Sumner, the Primate, 1859... ..	337, 347	93
———— death of, 1862	94
———— Bishop of Winchester, on revision, 1858	204	...
Sunday morning service, length of	231	...
Superis ita visum	98	...
Supplemental Rubrics, insufficiency of ...	167	...
Supremacy of the Church	309	...
Sure and certain hope, &c.	408	192
Surplice or gown in the pulpit, 1641—1871	...	369-371
Swallowing one's leek	279	...
Swift-winged arrows of wit	206
Sydenham palace, Sunday opening, 1858...	231	...
Sydney Smith and orthodox divines	282
————, a disciple of	423	...
———— and the Great Western Railway ...	318	...
———— definition of a discoverer	312
———— on the clerical profession	336	...
———— ou combative bishops	34
———— on length of the services	315	...
———— the Phœnix of an age	206
Synod of the United Church	310

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Synodical action	305
T. G., his attack on Ingoldsby, 1858	130-37	...
Tabernacle, Spurgeon's, 1861	285
Table of contents to a pamphlet	403	...
Tacent, satis laudant	247, 340	...
Tait Bishop, on subscription and revision	255, 339
———— his antecedents	227	...
———— his Charges, 1858, 1862	233	339
Talk of disruption, May, 1858	238	...
Talleyrand on the use of language	71	...
Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ	130	...
Tantalus, the ecclesiastical, 1859	339	...
Taunton, Archdeacon of, on revision, 1859	412	2
Taylor Isaac, Liturgy and Dissenters	60-66
————, Jeremy, on Athanasian Creed	182, 199
Tempora mutantur—nos et mutamur, &c.	207, 282	...
Ten Thousand, Advance and retreat of, 1860	67, 75, 213
Tendimus in Latium, 1859	262	...
That jewel, the Prayer-book	71	...
The beginning of strife	381	...
The Church in danger, 1858	73	...
The current that with gentle murmur glides	160	...
The family living	302
The memorable Ten Thousand, 1860	67, 75, 135
The right man in the wrong place	128
The rivals in the House of Lords, 1860	147
The skies will fall	340
The spear may enter where the arrow failed	274
The wily Pope sat by and smil'd	261	...
There always were dissenters	155
There are no tricks in plain and simple faith	102	...
There is a Providence that shapes our ends	116	...
There is much rubbish, 1861	217
There is no terror, Burgess, in thy threats	179	...
There's no offence, my lord, &c., 1873	361
These be thy gods, O Israel, 1860	55
Thin end of the wedge	364
Third service, form for, required	186
Thirlwall <i>versus</i> Bishop of St. David's	167	...
————, Bishop, as a Revisionist, 1859	295	...
Thirty-nine Articles, Bishop Fraser on, 1878	193
———— Nevile on	244
———— Newman on	192-3
———— reduced to twenty	174

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Thirty-sixth Canon	221
This is not the time	57, 416	...
This present time	71	103, 164
This story shall our chaplains, &c.	337	...
Though rapid Boreas sweep the ground, &c.	270	...
Thoughts on Church dignitaries (Butler)	234	...
——— on the Liturgy, by Rev. Philip Gell	54
Three services in one	29, 190	...
Thus have I heard on Afric's burning shore, &c.	152
Tillotson, Burnet, Tenison, and Watson	139, 153
——— on Athanasian Creed	208
Time and the bishops against a thousand	138, 297	...
——— the great innovator	336	...
Timely concession, value of	350	...
<i>Times</i> newspaper and Bishop of Chester, 1859	371	...
——— and clerical subscription, 1860	18—21
——— and Convocation, June, 1872	428	...
——— and Revision, 1859	373	...
'Tis my ambition not to rise	415	...
To be, or not to be, that is the question	196	...
To him that hath shall be given, 1858	111	...
To this favour must we come at last	144
Toleration Act of William III.	409	...
Tomline, Bishop, on Athanasian Creed	30
To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow	345	...
Tooth and Edge, controversy between, 1862	312
Torrens dicendi copia, &c.	69	...
Toryism by the vengeance, 1860	173
Totidem audiet, atque respicere, &c.	233
Touch not the Prayer-book, 1860	173
——— the Prayer-book, and we go, 1858... ..	79	...
Tractarian funeral in Lincolnshire, 1860	256-7	...
Training ground for the rising clergy, 1873	365
Translation of the Bible, new one	304
Tregynon, Perpetual Curate of	288	...
Trench Dean, on Bible revision	330	307, 311
Tria juncta in uno	29, 190	...
Troubling Israel	217	...
Truth, twofold view of	148
Truths invidious to the great	62
Tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum	170	...
Tua res agitur, paries cum proximus ardet	119	...
Turne, quod optanti, &c.	296	...
"Two Hundred Years ago," by Rev. D. Mountfield	218	258

	VOL. I.	VOL. II.
	PAGE	PAGE
Two still were wanting, &c.	96
Twofold truth...	148
'Twould be recorded for a precedent	143
Ubi Sisiphu' versat saxum, &c.	339	...
Ultra-Ritualism and Romanist practices	388
Unalterable law, and unalterable fool	326
Unam minimamque relinque, &c.	332
Unanimity of the bishops	206-7, 272	159
Un-English habit of mumbling the service	44	...
Unfeigned assent and consent	355	...
Uniformity, Act of, 1662	173, 184	196, 250
Union amongst Revisionists	276	...
—— Newspaper and Convocation, 1859	284	...
Unitarian revised Prayer-book of 1852	139
<i>Univers</i> Newspaper on Lord Ebury's motion	149	...
Uno avulso non deficit alter	159
Untouched and unaltered Prayer-book	344
Unworthy timidity	204	...
Urit enim fulgore suo, &c.	364	...
Ut miremur te, non tua, &c.	136	...
Ut silvæ foliis pronos mutantur in annos	157	...
Utcunque ferent ea facta minores	392	84
—— in alto ventu 'st, &c.	194	...
Vain repetitions, specimen of	68	...
Vast majority of the Bishop of Oxford	212
Vaughan, Dr. C. J., on candidates for ordination	177
Vaughan's Nonconformity	269
Venables, Rev. G., and Church Orders	406	...
Verbal Revision not worth its cost	336	97
Verbosæ et grandes orationes	190	...
Verily and indeed, objection to	190
Verum, nec nocte paratum, Plorabit qui me, &c.	125
Vestment squabble, 1859	356	...
Vesuvius, eruption of	401	...
Victoria, the reign of... ..	64	...
Villiers Bishop, on Revision, 1860	34
Vires acquirit eundo	165	...
Visions of Nailsworth, spare my aching sight	404	...
Visitation of the sick	156	181—191
—— queries in diocese of Lincoln, 1873	363
Vitæ summa brevis, &c.	343	...
Voice of the Church, 1867	310	358
Voilà tout	160
Volumus Liturgiam emendari	275	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Voting under difficulties, 1867	357
Vowler Short's book on the Church ...	281, 325-34	...
Vox omnibus una	277	...
— populi, vox dei	276	...
Waddington, Dean of Durham, 1861	214
Wafer bread forbidden	427	...
Waiting to act, whichever way, &c....	296	...
Waits till the river pass away, &c.	209
Wales, amount of Dissent in	287, 290	...
Wamba the witless	280	...
Warwick at the battle of Barnet	283	...
Waterland, and Athanasian Creed	207
"We dine, you know, with the other man," 1867...	...	357
We may, Sir, if we will	302	...
Webster Edward, lecture on Revision	216
Weekly offertory and monthly communion	261	...
Welsh clergy, the feeling of, 1858	169	...
——— Bishops on revision of the Prayer-book	289	...
Well begun, half done	168	...
We'll bob it again, 1858	93
Wellington Duke of, and the Reform Bill, 1831 ...	93	172, 267
Westminster manifesto, 1859-60	7, 25
What business have you to inquire?	342
——— is to be done?	181
——— is it you want?	183
——— is wanting	35	...
——— may be done, and ought to be done	...	50, 53
——— silent all?	273	...
——— would't thou do for her?	147
Whately Archbishop, on danger of delay ...	76	164
——— on Revision, 1840, 1860	10	107-111
What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba?	127
When ancient fabrics nod, &c.	150	...
——— Greek meets Greek, &c.	158
——— shall we three meet again?	286	...
Whiskers and cricket denounced by a bishop	...	228
Who listens once, will listen twice	142	...
——— is to do it?	157
——— shall decide when bishops disagree? ...	96	...
——— will take the first step?	266
Whom I most hated living, &c.	49
Whosoever sins thou dost, &c.	19, 20
Why only little men take orders, 1861	241
——— wait for worse times? (1859)	350	...

	VOL. I. PAGE	VOL. II. PAGE
Why was it not done? (1858)	105	...
Wieniawski, a modern Paganini, 1859	251	...
Wilberforce Bishop, in Convocation, 1858	65—73	...
William III., Commission under	184
———— IV. and Duke of Wellington	267
———— of Orange and the Prayer-book	184
———— Tell and the hat	180
———— Winstanley Hull on Church Matters	361	...
Williams, Rev. Rowland, D.D., 1860	204
Willing bondsmen	368	...
Winchelsey, Archbishop of Canterbury	261	...
Winchester, Bishop of (Sumner), 1858	204	...
———— on candidates for orders	177
Winsor, discoverer of gas	313
Wisdom of our ancestors	332
Wish father to the thought	152
Wodehouse, Canon, resignation of, 186017, 206,	212
Women, cooks, and perfumers	73
Woods, Rev. McClure, and the Dissenters, 1860	80
Worcester Bishop of (Philpott), Charge of, 1862	336
———— and Revision of the Prayer-book	181
———— and the black gown in preaching, 1871	370-71
Words are like leaves, and where, &c.	68	...
Wordsworth, Bishop, and his questions, 1872	362
———— Dr., of Trinity College, Cambridge...	209
Work of a Royal Commission	149
Working for good, 1859	368	...
Worst enemy of the Church...	234
Wounds and scars, 1860	121, 339
Wren Matthew, and the surplice, 1641	369
York, Archbishop of (Longley), May, 1862	334
—— Deanery, appointment to, 1858106, 133	...
You ask me if I ever knew Court chaplains, &c.	415	...
You have nothing to do with research	342

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. SERMONS, chiefly Practical, Preached at Whitehall during the Years 1843, 1844, 1845. London : J. W. Parker. Price 10s. 6d. 8vo.
2. THREE SERMONS on the PRESENT POSITION of the CHURCH. 1843. Rivingtons.
3. FIVE SERMONS, Preached before the University of Cambridge, January, 1841. With a Proposed Plan for the Study of Theology in the University. Price 5s.
4. The OBLIGATION of the UNIVERSITY : a Sermon, Preached before the University, October, 1841. With Appendix. Price 2s.
5. The UNIVERSITY SYSTEM of PRIVATE TUITION EXAMINED ; in an Intellectual, Moral, and Pecuniary Point of View. 1844. Price 1s. 6d.
6. MISSION to CHINA. Rivingtons. 1843. Price 1s.
7. FURTHER CONSIDERATION of the UNIVERSITY SYSTEM of EDUCATION : in a Letter to the Vice-Chancellor. 1845. Price 1s. 6d.
8. The MENÆCHMEI of PLAUTUS. With a Glossary and Notes in Latin. Second Edition. Price 7s. 6d.
9. The AULULARIA of PLAUTUS. With Notes and Glossary in Latin. Second Edition. Price 7s. 6d.
10. CLASSICAL EXAMINATIONS AT CHRIST'S COLLEGE. 1838.
11. ABRIDGMENT of the SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE, Advocated in a Letter to the Bishop of Ely. Second Edition. Groombridge. 1856. Price 1s.
12. FURTHER ARGUMENTS in Support of the Above, with a REPLY to the QUESTION, "HOW IS IT TO BE DONE?" Groombridge. 1856. Price 1s.
13. The PEOPLE'S CALL for a REVISION of the LITURGY, in a Letter to Lord Palmerston. Groombridge. 1857. Price 1s.
14. OCCASIONAL REFLECTIONS on MEN and THINGS, after the manner of Boyle. By a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN. Wertheim and Macintosh. 1861. 18mo. Price 6d.
15. NOTES upon the EVIDENCE taken before the ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION in the Parliamentary Session of 1862. Ridgway and Co., Piccadilly. 1863. Price 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM VOLUMES

Published by Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

Memories of My Exile.

By LOUIS KOSSUTH. A New and Important Work relating to the Period when the Italian Kingdom was being established, and giving the Secret Treaties and details of the understanding between England, the Emperor Napoleon, and Count Cavour. One Vol., 10s. 6d.

The New Parliament (1880).

By WILLIAM SAUNDERS. Containing a History of the Dissolution, Special Biographies of New Members, Election Incidents, Party Leaders, &c. 6s.

The Life of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone.

By GEORGE BARNETT SMITH. With Two Steel Portraits. *Cheap Edition*, in One Vol., cloth, 5s.

England: Its People, Polity, and Pursuits.

By T. H. S. ESCOTT. Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.

The English Army: Its Past History, Present Condition, and Future Prospects.

By Major ARTHUR GRIFFITHS. Demy 8vo, cloth, 21s.

The King's Secret.

By the DUC DE BROGLIE. Being the Secret Correspondence of Louis XV. with his Diplomatic Agents, from 1752 to 1774. Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.

Russia.

By D. MACKENZIE WALLACE, M.A. *Cheap Edition*, in One Vol., with Two Maps, 10s. 6d. *Library Edition*, Two Vols., 24s.

A Ride to Khiva.

By CAPTAIN BURNABY. *Cheap Edition*. With Maps, 7s. 6d.

The Great Thirst Land. A Ride through

Natal, Orange Free State, Transvaal, Kalahari. By PARKER GILLMORE ("Ubique"). *Cheap Edition*, with Map, 7s. 6d.

With the Armies of the Balkans and at Gallipoli,

1877-8. By Lieut.-Col. FIFE COOKSON. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. *Cheap Edition*, cloth, 5s.

Imperial England.

By Professor MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A., R.N. Price 6s.

Remedies for War, Political and Legal.

By Professor SHELDON AMOS, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Price 6s.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. : Ludgate Hill, London; Paris; and New York.

The French Revolutionary Epoch.

A History of France from the Beginning of the First Revolution to the End of the Second Empire. By HENRI VAN LAUN, Author of "The History of French Literature." Two Vols., demy 8vo, 24s.

England, Cassell's History of.

With about 2,000 Illustrations. Nine Vols., cloth, 9s. each. Or in library binding, £4 10s. complete.

United States, Cassell's History of the.

With 600 Illustrations and Maps. 1,950 pages, extra crown 4to. Complete in Three Vols., cloth, £1 7s.; or in library binding, £1 10s.

India, Cassell's History of.

With about 400 Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, Two Vols., cloth, 18s.; or in library binding, £1.

The War between France and Germany, Cassell's

History of. With 500 Engravings. Two Vols. Extra crown 4to, cloth, 18s.; or bound in half-calf, 30s.

The Russo-Turkish War, Cassell's History of.

Complete in Two Volumes. With about 500 ILLUSTRATIONS. Extra crown 4to, cloth, 9s. each.

British Battles on Land and Sea.

By JAMES GRANT, Author of the "Romance of War," &c. With about 600 Illustrations. Three Vols., extra crown 4to, cloth, £1 7s.; or in library binding, £1 10s.

Old and New London. A Narrative of its History, its People, and its Places. Complete in Six Vols., each containing 200 Illustrations, price 9s. each; or in library binding, the set of Six Vols., £3.

The History of Protestantism.

By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D. With upwards of 600 Original Illustrations. Three Vols., extra crown 4to, cloth, £1 7s.; or in library binding, £1 10s.

Heroes of Britain in Peace and War.

By EDWIN HOLDER. With about 300 Illustrations. Two Vols., extra crown 4to, cloth, 7s. 6d. each.

Decisive Events in History.

Fourth Thousand. By THOMAS ARCHER. With Sixteen Original Illustrations. Extra fcap. 4to, cloth gilt, 5s.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Volumes (Continued).

The Life and Work of St. Paul.

By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

The Life of Christ.

By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Illustrated Edition. With about 300 Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, cloth, gilt edges, 21s.; calf or morocco, £2 2s.

Library Edition. Two Vols., cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

THE NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY.

New Testament Commentary for English

Readers. Edited by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Three Vols., cloth, £3 3s.; or in half-morocco, £4 14s. 6d.

VOL. I. contains THE FOUR GOSPELS, price £1 1s.

VOL. II. contains THE ACTS to GALATIANS. £1 1s.

VOL. III. contains the EPHESIANS to the REVELATION. £1 1s.

The Half-Guinea Illustrated Bible.

Containing 900 Original Illustrations. Crown 4to, cloth, 10s. 6d.
Also in Leather bindings in great variety.

The Bible Educator.

Edited by the Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. With about 400 Illustrations and Maps. Four Vols., 6s. each; also in Two Vols., cloth, 21s.; or in library binding, £1 4s.

Family Prayers.

Prepared by a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and published by Authority of the House. Cloth, red edges, 1s.

Christ Bearing Witness to Himself.

Being the DONNELLAN LECTURES for 1878—9. By the Rev. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

Some Difficulties of Belief.

By the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A. Cloth, 6s.

The Life of the World to Come, and other Subjects.

By the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A. Cloth, 5s.

The Patriarchs.

By the Rev. W. HANNA, D.D., and the Rev. CANON NORRIS, B.D. 3s. 6d.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London: Paris; and New York.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Volumes (Continued).

Picturesque Europe.

Complete in Five Vols. Each containing Thirteen Exquisite Steel Plates from Original Drawings and nearly 200 Original Illustrations. With Descriptive Letterpress. Royal 4to, cloth, gilt edges, £2 2s. ; morocco, £5 5s. each.

Vols. I. and II. of PICTURESQUE EUROPE contain GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND complete. Vols. III., IV., and V. describe the Continent.

The Magazine of Art.

VOL. II. With an Etching for Frontispiece, and about 200 Illustrations by the best Artists. Extra crown 4to, 7s. 6d.

. *The price of Vol. I., which is becoming scarce, has been raised to 10s. 6d.*

Character Sketches from Dickens.

Consisting of Six *fac-simile* reproductions, large folio size, of Drawings by FRED BARNARD. In Portfolio, 21s.

Morocco: Its People and Places.

By EDMONDO DE AMICIS. Translated by C. ROLLIN-TILTON. With about 200 Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, cloth, 21s.

American Painters.

With Eighty-three Examples of their Works Engraved on Wood. By G. W. SHELDON. Demy 4to, cloth, 21s.

Pleasant Spots Around Oxford.

By ALFRED RIMMER. With numerous Original Woodcuts. Extra fcap. 4to, cloth gilt, 21s.

The Great Painters of Christendom, from

CIMABUE to WILKIE. By JOHN FORBES-ROBERTSON. Illustrated throughout. Royal 4to, cloth elegant, gilt edges, £3 3s.

Illustrated Travels.

Edited by H. W. BATES, Assistant-Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society. Complete in Six Vols., each containing about 200 Illustrations. Cloth, 15s. each ; cloth gilt, gilt edges, 18s. each.

The Doré Fine Art Volumes,

Published by CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO., comprise—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
The Doré Scripture Gallery	5	10	0	Purgatorio and Paradiso	2	10	0
The Doré Gallery	5	5	0	Don Quixote	1	10	0
The Doré Bible	4	4	0	La Fontaine's Fables	1	10	0
Milton's Paradise Lost	2	10	0	The Days of Chivalry	0	10	6
Dante's Inferno	2	10	0	Fairy Tales Told Again	0	5	0

. *Also kept in morocco bindings suitable for Presentation.*

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London ; Paris ; and New York.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Volumes (Continued).

The Wild White Cattle of Great Britain.

An Account of their Origin, History, and Present State. By the late Rev. JOHN STORER, M.A. With Illustrations, cloth gilt, 21s.

Animal Life, Described and Illustrated.

By Prof. E. PERCEVAL WRIGHT, M.D., F.L.S. Cloth, 15s.

Natural History of the Ancients, Gleanings

from the. By the Rev. W. HOUGHTON, M.A. Illustrated. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

The World of the Sea.

Translated by Rev. H. MARTYN-HART, M.A. Illustrated. 10s. 6d.

Transformations of Insects.

By Prof. DUNCAN, F.R.S. With 240 Engravings. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

Cassell's New Natural History.

Edited by Prof. DUNCAN, M.D., F.R.S., assisted by Eminent Writers. Illustrated throughout. Vols. I, II., and III., 9s. each.

The Book of the Horse.

By S. SIDNEY. With Twenty-five Coloured Plates, and 100 Wood Engravings. Demy 4to, cloth, 31s. 6d.; half-morocco, £2 2s.

The Illustrated Book of Poultry.

By L. WRIGHT. With 50 Coloured Plates, and numerous Wood Engravings. Demy 4to, cloth, 31s. 6d.; half-morocco, £2 2s.

The Illustrated Book of Pigeons.

By R. FULTON. Edited by L. WRIGHT. With Fifty Coloured Plates, and numerous Engravings. Demy 4to, cloth, 31s. 6d.; half-morocco, £2 2s.

Canaries and Cage-Birds, The Illustrated Book

of. With Fifty-six Coloured Plates, and numerous Illustrations. Demy 4to, cloth, 35s.

Louis Figuier's Popular Scientific Works.

New and Cheaper Editions. Containing all the Original Illustrations, the TEXT REVISED AND CORRECTED, price 7s. 6d. each:—

The Human Race. Revised by ROBERT WILSON.

Mammalia. Revised by Professor E. PERCEVAL WRIGHT, M.D.

The World Before the Deluge. Revised by W. H. BRISTOW, F.R.S.

The Ocean World. Revised by Prof. E. PERCEVAL WRIGHT, M.D.

Reptiles and Birds. Revised by Captain PARKER GILLMORE.

The Insect World. Revised by Professor DUNCAN, M.D., F.R.S.

The Vegetable World. Revised by an Eminent Botanist.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London; Paris; and New York.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Volumes (Continued).

The Encyclopædic Dictionary.

By ROBERT HUNTER, M.A., F.G.S., Mem. Bibl. Archæol. Soc., &c.
A New and Original Work of Reference to all the Words in the
English Language, with a Full Account of their Origin, Meaning,
Pronunciation, and Use. Vol. I., extra crown 4to, cloth, 10s. 6d.

Library of English Literature.

Edited by Prof. HENRY MORLEY. With Illustrations taken from
Original MSS., &c. Each Vol. complete in itself.

VOL. I. SHORTER ENGLISH POEMS. 12s. 6d.

VOL. II. ILLUSTRATIONS OF ENGLISH RELIGION. 11s. 6d.

VOL. III. ENGLISH PLAYS. 11s. 6d.

VOL. IV. SHORTER WORKS IN ENGLISH PROSE. 11s. 6d.

Dictionary of English Literature.

Being a Comprehensive Guide to English Authors and their Works.
By W. DAVENPORT ADAMS. 720 pages, extra fcap. 4to, cloth, 15s.

A First Sketch of English Literature.

By Professor HENRY MORLEY. Crown 8vo, 912 pages, cloth, 7s. 6d.

Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.

Giving the Derivation, Source, or Origin of 20,000 Words that
have a Tale to Tell. By Rev. Dr. BREWER. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

The Leopold Shakspeare.

The Poet's Works in Chronological Order, and an Introduction
by F. J. FURNIVALL. With about 400 Illustrations. Small 4to,
10s. 6d. Dedicated by permission to H.R.H. PRINCE LEOPOLD.

Royal Quarto Shakespeare.

Edited by CHARLES and MARY COWDEN CLARKE. With 600
Illustrations by H. C. SELOUS. Three Vols., cloth gilt, £3 3s.

The Practical Dictionary of Mechanics.

Containing 15,000 Drawings, with Comprehensive and TECHNICAL
DESCRIPTION of each Subject. Three Volumes, cloth, £3 3s.

Sketching from Nature in Water-Colours.

By AARON PENLEY. With Illustrations in Chromo-Lithography,
after Original Water-Colour Drawings. Super-royal 4to, cloth, 15s.

Principles of Ornamental Art.

By F. E. HULME, F.L.S., F.S.A., Art Master in Marlborough
College. With over 400 Designs. Royal 4to, cloth, 25s.

Studies in Design.

By CHRISTOPHER DRESSER, Ph.D., F.L.S., &c. Consisting of
Sixty Original Designs. Demy folio, cloth, £3 3s.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. : Ludgate Hill, London : Paris ; and New York.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co's Volumes (Continued).

Our Own Country.

An Illustrated Geographical and Historical Description of the Chief Places of Interest in Great Britain. Vols. I. & II., with upwards of 200 Illustrations in each, 7s. 6d. each.

The International Portrait Gallery.

Containing Portraits in Colours, executed in the best style of Chromo-Lithography, of the Distinguished Celebrities of Foreign Nations, with Biographies from authentic sources. Demy 4to, cloth gilt, 12s. 6d.

The National Portrait Gallery.

Complete in Four Volumes. Each containing 20 Portraits, printed in the best style of Chromo-Lithography, of our most distinguished Celebrities, with accompanying Memoirs. Demy 4to, cloth gilt, 12s. 6d. each.

Familiar Wild Flowers.

FIRST and SECOND SERIES. By F. E. HULME, F.L.S., F.S.A. With Forty Full-page Coloured Plates and Descriptive Text. 12s. 6d. each.

Familiar Garden Flowers.

FIRST SERIES. By SHIRLEY HIBBERD. With Forty Full-page Coloured Plates by F. E. HULME. 12s. 6d.

Science for All.

VOLS. I. and II. Edited by Dr. ROBERT BROWN, M.A., F.L.S., &c., assisted by eminent Scientific Writers. Each containing about 350 Illustrations and Diagrams. Extra crown 4to, cloth, 9s. each.

The Field Naturalist's Handbook.

By the Rev. J. G. WOOD and THEODORE WOOD. Cloth, 5s.

The Races of Mankind.

By ROBERT BROWN, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S., F.R.G.S. Complete in Four Vols., containing upwards of 500 Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, cloth gilt, 6s. per Vol. ; or Two Double Vols., £1 1s.

The Countries of the World.

By ROBERT BROWN, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S., F.R.G.S. Vols. I., II., III., and IV., with 130 Illustrations in each. 4to, 7s. 6d. each.

The Sea: Its Stirring Story of Adventure, Peril, and Heroism.

By F. WHYMPER. VOLS. I., II., and III., each containing 100 Original Illustrations. 4to, 7s. 6d. each.

Great Industries of Great Britain.

Complete in Three Vols., each with about 130 Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, 320 pages, cloth, 7s. 6d. each.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. : Ludgate Hill, London ; Paris ; and New York.

Selections from Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Volumes (Continued).

The Family Physician.

A Modern Manual of Domestic Medicine. By PHYSICIANS and SURGEONS of the Principal London Hospitals. Royal 8vo, cloth, 21s.

The Domestic Dictionary.

An Encyclopædia for the Household. 1,280 pages, royal 8vo, half-roan, 15s.

Cassell's Household Guide.

New and Revised Edition. With Illustrations on nearly every page, and COLOURED PLATES. Complete in Four Vols., 6s. each.

Cassell's Dictionary of Cookery.

With Numerous Engravings and Full-page Coloured Plates. Containing about 9,000 Recipes. 1,280 pages, royal 8vo, half-roan, 15s.

A Year's Cookery.

Giving Dishes for Breakfast, Luncheon, and Dinner for Every Day in the Year, with Practical Instructions for their Preparation. By PHILLIS BROWNE. Cloth gilt, 5s.

The Ladies' Physician.

A Guide for Women in the Treatment of their Ailments. Cloth, 6s.

A Handbook of Nursing, for the Home and for the Hospital.

By CATHERINE J. WOOD. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Common Sense Cookery.

By A. G. PAYNE. 256 pages, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

Common Sense Housekeeping.


By PHILLIS BROWNE. 256 pages, extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Manners of Modern Society.

A Comprehensive and Practical Work on the Etiquette of the Present Day. *Cheap Edition.* Stiff boards, 1s. ; cloth, 1s. 6d.

How Women may Earn a Living.

By MERCY GROGAN. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

 **Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Complete Catalogue,** containing a List of Several Hundred Volumes, including Bibles and Religious Works, Fine-Art Volumes, Children's Books, Dictionaries, Educational Works, Handbooks and Guides, History, Natural History, Household and Domestic Treatises, Science, Serials, Travels, &c. &c., sent post free on application.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London ; Paris ; and New York.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 856 835 4

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

BS145 H5471 1079

2

41.0V480.1N504.0787

